

# THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

---

No. 4.—OCTOBER, 1903.

---

## I.

### THE HIGHER CRITICISM AS APPLIED TO THE PENTATEUCH.

BY REV. PROF. F. A. GAST, D.D.

The method employed by the higher criticism is, as we have already seen,\* the same as the method employed by science with such marvelous success and such splendid results. Only the object is different,—in the one case, nature; in the other, history. For the higher criticism deals exclusively with questions of a historical character pertaining to the origin and growth of Biblical literature. Its method is the inductive, basing its conclusions on verified facts. For these it searches diligently—making as complete a collection as possible even of such as have apparently but a slight bearing on the question under discussion—scrutinizing them from every point of view—combining them and drawing inferences from the combinations—and so, from isolated and scattered facts, advancing step by step to a general hypothesis explicative of the facts.

If, however, new facts are discovered or old facts receive a better interpretation, the hypothesis may have to be modified or even cast aside. A hypothesis is valid only when it explains all the known facts. Criticism, like every other science,

\* REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, July, 1903.

is subject to change with advancing knowledge. When such change is seen to be necessary and is generally accepted by competent critics, it may be regarded as a sure indication of true progress.

It is evident from the history of the higher criticism during the last century and a half that, on all the broader, most fully investigated questions, scholars have been gradually coming into closer agreement, until now they are practically at one in their results. It is only on questions comparatively new, or of a secondary character, especially such as relate to editorial revisions and additions, that critics, even the ablest, are widely at variance and reach at times opposite conclusions. Such questions demand a closer study. Perhaps for a trustworthy answer, the facts hitherto discovered are too few, or too difficult of interpretation. On a more careful and minute inquiry additional evidence may be gathered, which will shed new light on what is now obscure, and so lead on to a satisfactory decision. At all events, the differences of the critics on subordinate questions still under discussion cannot outweigh their agreements on all questions that are fundamental.

It may be well, however, after thus abstractly stating the scientific inductive method of the higher criticism, to let the uninitiated reader follow closely in the footsteps of the critic, as he applies the method to the investigation of some particular question. He who, before inquiry, not unnaturally distrusts the established results of modern criticism, and shrinks from them as perilous, not only to tradition, but to the truth—which must be the sole object of our pursuit—may in this way trace out for himself the whole process by which these results have been reached, and assure himself, if he will, that they are strictly legitimate. The critic needs have no concealments. He is consciously innocent of the charge sometimes thoughtlessly made, of stealthily introducing by a kind of intellectual *leger-de-main*, new and baseless theories with a view to subvert the truth. Rather he courts the most searching scrutiny of his work.

Let us, then, take the Pentateuch-question and follow with close attention the course pursued by the critic. It must be remembered that the method consists in drawing correct inferences from an adequate number of verified facts. Perhaps we shall find the critic alleging as facts what after all are not facts, or facts misinterpreted; or we may find him tripping in his logic by deducing unjustifiable inferences from acknowledged facts. In either case he has misapplied the scientific method, and to the extent of its misapplication his conclusions are untrustworthy. And to test the method we can have no better question than that of the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch stands at the head of the Old Testament canon, and is regarded by the rabbins as the product of the highest degree of inspiration. It is the fundamental law of the Jewish church and has played a prominent part in the Christian church. Its very importance would naturally suggest the question of its origin. And in this view it is not surprising that of all the Old Testament writings it was the first to be subjected to criticism. Moses' literary authorship of the whole book was denied by some heretical sects among the early Christians and by a number of learned scholars among the mediæval Jews. Such denial, however, extended only to certain portions. But now, while ancient tradition says that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, modern criticism says that it is the result of a long complicated literary process running through the course of several centuries. Which is right?

If we would answer this question we must examine without prejudice the evidence the critic presents, and estimate its weight by testing his alleged facts to see whether they really are facts, and his inferences from the facts to see whether they are correctly deduced.

It will not be questioned that we should, first of all, hear the testimony of the Pentateuch itself. Does it claim that *in its present form and extent*, it has come from the pen of Moses? If there are parts not written by him, such as the account of his death (Deut. XXXIV), we must cease to con-

tend for the Mosaic authorship of the whole book. It then becomes an open question of *plus* or *minus*—how much is to be ascribed to him, or how little, or whether any part at all. There is no tradition that settles this question, and pre-suppositions based on dogmatic considerations can have no force. Both the critic and his opponent are thrown back upon the facts in the case, and these must be ascertained by diligent inquiry.

Let us then make a close search of the Pentateuch, from its beginning to its end, to find out whether it contains an explicit assertion that Moses is its literary author. For such an assertion we shall search in vain. *The Pentateuch is anonymous*, surprising as this fact may seem to the reader who has known only the traditional opinion on this subject and has made no personal investigation of the question.

The name of the author, whether Moses or some other, does not appear in *any authentic title*. In this respect it is like the historical books in general and probably for the same reason, because, as the critic maintains, all alike are demonstrably of composite structure. The titles "Joshua" and "Samuel" for example do not designate those worthies as the authors of the books so named, but as the principal characters of the history recorded in them. For, of course, Joshua did not write the account of his own death, stating the exact number of years he lived and the very spot of his burial, "on the north side of the hill Gaash" (Josh. XXIV: 29 and 30), and the death of Samuel is mentioned already in the first Book of Samuel XXV: I. The name of Moses however does not stand at the head of the five first books of the Old Testament, as the name of Joshua stands at the head of the sixth. The title of the Pentateuch in the original text is simply "The Law," not "the Law of Moses." We are all familiar, indeed, with the designation "the five Books of Moses." Our English version gives the individual books a double title: "Genesis, or the first Book of Moses," and so on throughout the five books. But this subtitle is not original.



It is first found in the Christian Church, and not earlier than Rufinus (+ 410 A. D.) and Jerome (+ 420 A. D.), when the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch had become the accepted belief.

And so, too, *Moses' authorship of the book as a whole is not affirmed anywhere in the book itself.* Several times indeed, Moses is mentioned as making records in writing. Let us collect all the statements of this kind found in the Pentateuch and ask ourselves whether they prove that he wrote the whole book, or only intend to say that he wrote certain parts. In Ex. XVII: 8-14 stands an account of the battle with Amalek, which Moses is commanded to write "for a memorial in a book." The original is literally: "in *the* book," and the presence of the definite article might, with a degree of plausibility, be regarded as pointing to the Pentateuch, if the article were not often employed in Hebrew to denote the species, as well as the individuals belonging to the species. It is used in the same way in English, as, when we say: "the horse is a quadruped," meaning by the horse not an individual horse, but the species. Even if we should translate: "in *the* book," some well known book appointed for the purpose, we would not be compelled to suppose it the Pentateuch; it might be some lost book, like the "Book of the Wars of the Lord," mentioned in Num. XXI: 14. And so, taking the words by themselves, apart from all other evidence, it cannot justly be inferred that the book in which Moses is said to have recorded the battle with Amalek is our Pentateuch, or even that the record he made is precisely that which is found in Ex. XVII. All that the language implies is that, in the opinion of the narrator, Moses wrote an account of the battle in a book, known and used by the writer of Ex. XVII: 8-10; and, accordingly, if we except the Syriac, all the ancient versions, as well as the English version, both Authorized and Revised, translate: "in *a* book."

Again, in Ex. XXIV: 4 we read: "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord." What were those words? Clearly

the words spoken to Moses by the Lord in the chapters immediately preceding, which Moses recorded after repeating them to the people and obtaining their promise of obedience. This excludes the Decalogue (Ex. XX: 2-17), which was proclaimed by the voice of God, not to Moses only, but to all the people (XX: 19), and afterward engraved, not by Moses, but by the very finger of God on two tables of stone (XXXI: 18). The words which Moses is said to have written are unquestionably those contained in Ex. XX: 22-XXIII: 33, the Covenant code.

A third reference to Moses' literary activity is found in Ex. XXXIV: 27, 28, where he is divinely commanded to "write these words," that is, the words just spoken to him in this chapter, and it is added that "he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments," a second Decalogue written not by the finger of God, but by Moses, and which scholars since Goethe have sought for in this critically difficult chapter.

A list of the stations in the wilderness is also ascribed to Moses (Num. XXXIII: 1, 2); and finally, it is said "Moses wrote this law" (Deut. XXXI: 9, 24, 26). But what are we to understand by "this law?" Certainly not the whole Pentateuch; for the writer of verses 24 and 26, before bringing the Pentateuch to its close, expressly asserts that "Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished." Whatever this book, the writing of it was an accomplished fact, and a completed copy had been delivered to the Levitical priests to put by the side of the ark of the covenant. Moses, the writer of "the words of this law," is clearly not identical with the author of the Pentateuch as a whole.

Apart from all other evidence, this is rendered absolutely certain by a fact mentioned in the second Book of Kings, where we are told, that "the book of the law" found in the eighteenth year of Josiah (621 B. C.) by the high priest Hilkiah, was read twice consecutively in one day,

first by Shaphan in the Temple (XXII: 8), and later by Shaphan before the King (v. 10). Now, no one doubts that this newly discovered "book of the law" was either the Pentateuch itself, or some part of it. The Pentateuch it could not have been, because a single reading at a moderately rapid rate, such as will allow the mind to apprehend the meaning of the words, is impossible in less than twenty hours.\* How, then, could it have been read twice by the same person on the same day, now in the temple, and again in the palace? Accordingly, it is now conceded that "the book of the law" which Moses is said to have written, is the legislative part of Deuteronomy (XII-XXVI), with probably the hortatory introduction (V-XI), and the appendix containing the blessings and curses (XXVIII). This view, and this alone, accords with the narrative in the second Book of Kings, chapters XXII and XXIII.

Nowhere, then, either in the title or in the text, does the Pentateuch positively assert that Moses is its author. It does state in five instances that he made certain records of greater or less extent. If we grant that these statements are historically correct and that the records in question are in their original form embodied in the Pentateuch, what follows? That because it is expressly mentioned that he wrote several sections of the book, therefore he wrote the whole book? If he is the author of the whole, why does he only claim the authorship of several parts? Does not this special and exceptional mention rather imply that the narrator in each instance carefully distinguishes himself from Moses?

\* The present writer, by way of trial, took a common edition of the Hebrew Bible, and found that, on a more than ordinarily rapid reading, it required somewhat more than twenty minutes to read five pages intelligibly. Now, the Pentateuch in this edition comprises 350 pages, a single continuous reading of which would occupy 1,400 minutes, or 23½ hours. Remembering that Kittel in his *Geschichte der Hebräer* has given his estimate of the time required, the writer was surprised on turning to the book to find on page 52 that the results reached agree almost to the fraction—23½ hours against 23½.

But, perhaps, some one may ask, "Is not the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch asserted in other books of the Old Testament?" Let us examine this question and see whether the result gives certainty, or even lends a degree of probability, to the traditional opinion. We first take up *the prophetical books*. If the Pentateuch as it has been transmitted to us was written by Moses, it was in existence in the days of the great prophets of Israel, and its authorship must have been known to them, if known at all. Do they betray such knowledge? They indeed make mention of him in the following places arranged in the chronological order of occurrence: (1) Hosea XII: 13 (v. 14 in the Hebrew text); (2) Micah VI: 4; (3) Jeremiah XV: 1; (4) Isaiah LXIII: 11, 12; (5) Malachi IV: 4 (III: 22 in the Hebrew); (6) Daniel IX: 11, 13; of which the three first are pre-exilic (if Hosea XII: 12, 13 is genuine, which is somewhat doubtful); the three last are post-exilic. When we consider the important rôle played by Moses in the Pentateuch, we cannot but wonder that the prophets allude to him so rarely. Of the sixteen prophetical books, only five mention him by name; Hosea speaks of him as a prophet, but leaves him unnamed. And mark the character in which he is presented. In Hosea and Micah he appears as a deliverer, though in the latter not alone, but in connection with Aaron and Miriam. In Jeremiah he is put on the same plane with Samuel, as a powerful intercessor. In Isaiah he is the shepherd of Yahveh's flock, animated by the holy spirit of God and working stupendous marvels. It would seem as if with the lapse of time he is surrounded by an ever brighter glory. And yet it is not until we come to Malachi (about 458 B. C.) that we find him named as law-giver. Only it must not be supposed that the "law of Moses" which he here enjoins his readers to remember is our present Pentateuch; it designates, rather, the Deuteronomic Code (XII-XXVI), as is evident from the terms employed by the prophet: "statutes and judgments"; "Horeb," not Sinai, as the seat of the lawgiving;

"the sons of Levi," not as in the priestly legislation, "Aaron and his sons" as the designation of the priests (III:3)—names and phrases distinctly characteristic of the Deuteronomic law, which Malachi doubtless believed, on the basis of Deut. XXXI: 9, to have been written by Moses. Of course, when the Book of Daniel was written (about 165 B. C.), the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch was the current belief. It follows, therefore, from what has been said, that *all the prophets before Malachi and Daniel maintain absolute silence in regard to a body of laws written down by Moses.*

Let us pass, then, from the prophetic to the *historical books*, where we find repeated mention of a Mosaic law-book. But as it comes to view in the books of Joshua and Kings it cannot be identified with our present Pentateuch, but only with the Book of Deuteronomy, to which all the references are made and are closely parallel in thought and language. This will at once appear on a comparison of Josh. I: 7, 8 with Deut. XXXI: 7, 32, XXVIII: 14, and XVII: 18, 19; Josh. VIII: 32 with Deut. XXVII: 2, 8; Josh. VIII: 34 with Deut. XXVIII; Josh. XXII: 5 with Deut. X: 12; 1 Kg. II: 3 with Deut. XXIX: 9; 2 Kg. XIV: 6 with Deut. XXIV: 16. The question, what is meant by "the book of the law of Moses," referred to in the Book of Nehemiah (VIII: 1 and elsewhere), whether the entire Pentateuch, or only the priestly legislation contained in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, is one about which critical scholars differ. But no one doubts that Pentateuch as we have it lay before the writer of Chronicles, in as much as it is presupposed by the genealogies recorded in Chron. I-IX, and that Moses was regarded by him as the author of the law, and most probably also as the writer of the book.

The tradition, then, of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is very late. There is no hint of it before the exile in either the prophetic or the historical books. It first makes its appearance in the latest post-exilic books of the Old Testament. It may be as old as the time of Nehemiah; it very

probably existed in the time of the Chronicler, about 250 B. C. But what value can we attach to a tradition about Moses, which originated a thousand years after his age?

All this, however, does not prove that the Pentateuch is not the work of Moses; it only proves that no such claim was put forward until long after the exile (586 B. C.). Let us then advance to positive ground and inquire whether there are any *parts of the Pentateuch which Moses probably would not, or actually could not, have written.*

The Pentateuch throughout speaks of Moses in the third person, except in the discourses of Deuteronomy, where the first person is employed. This is somewhat strange, if he is the author of the book. It is not the usual manner of an autobiographer, though not unexampled, as Caesar in his Commentaries on the Gallic War does the same. It is very unlikely, however, that an author would within the brief compass of four words refer to himself in both the third person and the first. But this is what Moses is said to have done, when, in the presence of the children of Israel just before his death, he poured out upon them his blessing. (Deut. XXXIII: 1), in the course of which he says: "Moses commanded us a law" (v. 4). Such a form of expression would be natural in a poem about Moses only if not written by himself. And who, believing in Moses' authorship of the whole Pentateuch, must not be greatly surprised at the terms of self-praise with which he commends himself to the world, when he says: "Now the man Moses was very humble above all the men which were upon the face of the earth" (Num. XII: 3)? The word here in the English version rendered *meek*, that is patient of the wrongs of men, signifies *lowly, humble* before God. But can we suppose that, if he was the most humble of all men he would proclaim that fact to the world (see also Ex. XI: 3)?

These, however, are after all mere probabilities. Let us rather seek certainty; and this we shall find, if there are *passages Moses could not have written*, because they imply a

time later, often much later, than the age when he lived. We call attention only to a few out of a large number.

Among these we need not remind the reader of the account of Moses' death (Deut. XXXIV: 5-8). No one to-day seriously believes that it was recorded by Moses himself; and though Philo and Josephus would escape the difficulty by maintaining that he wrote it in the spirit of prophecy, the Talmud already denies its Mosaic origin and ascribes the last eight verses of the chapter to Joshua. The Pentateuch contains statements which either imply or assert that, at the time they were written, the pre-Israelite peoples of Canaan no longer occupied the land, but that Israel was, and had long been, in full possession, a condition that had no existence till a considerable period after Moses' death. "The Canaanite was then (in Abraham's time) in the land" (Gen. XII: 6), implying that he was not in the land at the time of writing, though he was, as we know, throughout Moses' life. Israel is not to commit the abominations of their predecessors, "that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued (not "will spue") out the nations that were before you" (Lev. XVIII: 28). "The children of Esau succeeded them (the Horims) when they had destroyed them from before them, and dwelt in their stead; as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them" (Deut. II: 12). There was no king in Israel until generations after Moses; yet the Pentateuch says: "These are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom; before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (Gen. XXXVI: 31). These words cannot be twisted to mean anything else than that there was a succession of Edomite kings reaching quite up to the establishment of monarchy in Israel. And when it is said: "There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses" (Deut. XXXIV: 10), the declaration implies a writer who had known a long line of great prophets.

In the narrative portions of the Book of Deuteronomy Moses is spoken of, but in the discourses he is the speaker.



Now, on the supposition that he is the author of that book, we find ourselves at times in strange perplexity through the occurrence of a phrase signifying "on the other side of Jordan." That side, whether the east or the west, depends on the position of the writer or speaker. If he is on the east side of the Jordan, the expression can only mean the territory west of the river; if he is on the west side, it can only mean the territory east of it. In the mouth of Moses, speaking in Moab on the east side of the Jordan, which he never crossed, the phrase always points to the west Jordanic territory, as in III: 20, 25; but in the narrative where he is not speaking, it signifies the country east of the Jordan. Thus I: 1 reads in the revised version: "These be the words which Moses spake to all Israel beyond Jordan"; and I: 5, "Beyond Jordan in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare this law." Now, if Moses was on the east side of Jordan, in the land of Moab, how could he at one and the same time be on the west side, as he must have been if, as the author of Deuteronomy, he wrote these words. King James' translators, influenced, doubtless unconsciously, by the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship of the book, render the phrase when it occurs in the narrative parts "on this side Jordan," but when it proceeds from the mouth of Moses "on the other side Jordan"; and so, by giving opposite meanings to the same word, they kindly permit Moses to remain on the east side.

It follows from what has been said that the Pentateuch is, to a greater or less extent, *not* Mosaic. Every candid mind will, after an impartial consideration, concede the existence of numerous passages which cannot have been written till long after the death of Moses. And this naturally leads to the question, *whether the Pentateuch in its present form is the work of a single author.* The affirmative it is impossible to maintain, when, setting all other evidence aside, we reflect only on the many wide divergencies and irreconcilable contradictions with which we are confronted throughout the book. Space will allow us to cite a very few only.

When, after the birth of Isaac, Hagar was sent forth by Abraham, she bore her child, Ishmael, on her shoulder, and, the water in the bottle being spent, cast him under one of the shrubs (Gen. XXI: 14, 15). Now, by a comparison of XVI: 16, XXI: 5, and XXI: 8-14, we find that this child, handled like an infant by its mother, was a young man at least sixteen years old; for he was born fourteen years before Isaac, and was dismissed only after Isaac was weaned at the age of two or three years.

Esau's three wives are named in XXVI: 34 and XXVIII: 9, *Judith*, *Bashemath* and *Mahalath*; but in XXXVI: 2, 3, *Adah*, *Aholibamah* and *Bashemath*. Here are two lists purporting to give the names of Esau's three wives with only one name in common, *Mahalath*. Besides, in the first list it is *Mahalath*, in the second, *Bashemath*, who is the daughter of Ishmael and sister of Nebayoth, though *Bashemath* of the first list is the daughter of Elon, the Hittite.

Joseph, when his brothers plot to kill him (Gen. XXXVII: 19, 20), is rescued by *Reuben*, according to verse 21, but by *Judah*, according to verses 26, 27. *Midianites*, who probably stole him (Gen. XL: 15), carried him to Egypt and sold him to Potiphar, captain of the guard (v. 28, first half, and 36); but according to verses 25, 27, 28, second half, it was *Ishmaelites* who, having bought Joseph of his brothers, carried him to Egypt. The brothers open their sacks and find the money in them at the lodging-place by the way (XLII: 27, 28); but according to v. 35, this occurred at home in the presence of their father.

But some one may say: "these instances are all taken from the Book of Genesis, and in spite of them, Moses may still be the author of that book; for in the composition of it, he had necessarily to employ earlier documents, and these alone are responsible for any discrepancies that may be found." That sounds very plausible. But let us turn to the history of his own times, with which, it is reasonable to suppose, he was accurately acquainted, and we shall meet with

the same confused and sometimes contradictory statements.

What was the name of Moses' father-in-law? In Ex. II: 16-21 he is called *Reuel*, the priest of Midian; in Ex. III: 1, IV: 18, XVIII: 1-12, *Jethro*, the priest of Midian; while in Num. X: 29, we read "*Hobah*, the son of Raguel (*Reuel*) the Midianite, Moses' father in law." It would be absurd to think that Moses did not know the name of his own father-in-law. The fault, then, cannot lie with him, but with the several different post-Mosaic traditions about him. And, again, is it conceivable that he should be ignorant of the place where his brother Aaron died? Yet two places are named in the Pentateuch, Mt. Hor (Num. XX: 23-29), and Mosera (Deut. X: 6). And, still again, can we believe that Moses, who sent out the spies to reconnoitre the land, could write so inconsistent a history as we find in Num. XIII and XIV. Observe a few of the discrepancies. The place from which the spies set out is different; now it is the wilderness of Paran (XIII: 3), now Kadesh (v. 26). The country traversed by them is said to be the whole land of Canaan, from the southern extremity to the northern (verses 2, 17, 21); while, according to verses 22, 23, they did not go beyond the southern district, in fact only as far as Hebron and Eshcol. On their return they report that the land *eateth up the inhabitants*, that is, is unproductive (v. 32); according to verses 27-31, 33, however, it flows with milk and honey, but is unconquerable. Caleb alone dissents from the report of the majority (v. 30), and is exempted from punishment (XIV: 24), but in XIV: 6, 7, both Joshua and Caleb dissent and both are exempted (v. 38). Such ignorance on the part of Moses of important facts and events in his own history is absolutely inconceivable; and the presence of such striking incongruities, amounting at times to flat contradictions, is explicable only on the supposition that *the Pentateuch is not the work of a single author, but a more or less skillful compilation from several documents written by different hands, at different dates and from different points of view.*

In proof of this we need only examine the many *duplicate narratives* which are found throughout the book. An examination of all is here, of course, out of the question. But let us take a single instance which may serve to show their general character. We select the first that comes to view—the double account of creation. The one narrative, which for the sake of brevity we shall designate P, is contained in Gen. I: 1–11, 4 first half; the other, which we shall designate J, begins with the words: “in the day that the LORD God (Jahveh Elohim) made the earth and the heavens” (v. 4), and occupies the remainder of the second chapter. Let us examine their characteristic features.

And, first, no attentive reader can fail to notice that the mode of presenting the order of creation is widely different. According to P the process runs through six creative days, and the movement is from below upward in successive stages until it terminates in man, the crown of creation. On the third day, after the land had emerged out of the waters, vegetation appears, herb, and fruit-bearing tree. On the fifth day the denizens of the air and the water—the fowl of the heavens and the fish of the sea—are called into existence. On the first half of the sixth day the land animals are made—cattle and creeping thing and beast of the earth. Not until the second half of the sixth day is man created, both male and female.

How very unlike this is the story of creation as told by J. Not only is he silent as to the six days, speaking only of “the day that Jahveh Elohim made the earth and the heavens,” but what is most striking is that he places man *first*, in the order of creation, not, as P, last. He tells of a time when there was as yet no plant or herb; and he assigns the reason, viz., because “Jahveh Elohim had not caused it to rain upon the earth,” and “there was not a man to till the ground” (II: 5). These two conditions had first to be met. And, accordingly, “there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground” (v. 6) “and Jahveh Elohim formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed

into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul" (v. 7). Thus, according to J, it was only *after* man was created that vegetation became possible, for he was needed to cultivate the ground. But when the earth was watered and man appeared upon the scene, then "out of the ground made Jahveh Elohim to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food" (v. 9). Man, however, needs more than food, he needs companionship also. And so, Jahveh Elohim formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and brought them to man; but among them all "there was not to be found a help meet for him" (verses 18-19). One more creative act is necessary, and it is the last—the formation of woman from a rib taken from the side of man, that she may be a suitable companion for him (verses 21-24). The order of creation, then, in P is: vegetation, animal life, man and woman created at the same time; for on the sixth day "male and female created he them" (I: 27). The order in J is: man, vegetation, the animals, last of all woman.

Another noticeable feature of these narratives is seen in the Divine names. P here employs Elohim (rendered God) 36 times in the short compass of 24½ verses, and that to the exclusion of every other name. J, on the other hand, employs Jahveh Elohim (rendered LORD God) 11 times in the second chapter from the middle of the fourth verse, and no other name. This fact is certainly strange, if both narratives come from a single author. Nor can it be explained by a difference in the signification of the names, Elohim designating the God of creation and Jahveh Elohim, the God of revelation; for both appear here in the character of creator.

Add to this the difference in the style and language of the two stories. The style of P is peculiar. Notice his systematic arrangement of the material according to a well defined scheme; his minuteness and precision in presenting details; his stereotyped formulas; his constant repetition of the same words. The style of J, on the other hand, is smooth and flowing. His descriptions are pictorial, not abstractly scientific,

and, free from the verbosity of P, move on gradually and easily from one event to another. The two styles are so markedly distinct, that no reader with a cultivated sense for style can read even the English Bible and suppose that both stories came from the same hand.

Besides, each account is characterized by words and phrases never, or only rarely, found in the other. But this is a feature we shall pass by, as possessing no interest for the general reader, merely mentioning one out of a considerable number met with in these two accounts of creation. The word signifying "to create (*bara*) occurs here 7 times in P, never once in J, though if J is identical with P, we can see no reason for his using it in the first account and avoiding it in the second, where J employs instead of *bārā*, the words "to make" (*āsāh*) and "to form" or "fashion" (*yāṣar*).

How, now, shall we account for two such discrepant narratives, the one immediately following the other, if both were written by one and the same hand? Of course, the broad differences between the two narratives have long been perceived, and many, but futile attempts have been made to harmonize them. Do they admit of reconciliation? It has been said that the discrepancies and contradictions are not real, but exist only in the mind of the critic, who, in the interest of a preconceived theory, creates them himself by a false interpretation of the accounts. But who can deny that the critic's representation is based upon the natural meaning of the two narratives? If they were found anywhere else than in the Bible, and read each apart from the other, would any honest, intelligent mind affirm that they are in perfect accord? The forced exegesis is to be ascribed here, not to the critic, but to his opponent, who, on the supposition that both these stories of creation were written by one and the same author, is under the necessity of reconciling them as best he can.

Or shall we say that J is only a supplement to P, furnishing certain particulars which could not well find a place in the scheme of P? Of course they could not, for they would in-

roduce into the narrative of P a series of intolerable contradictions. Suppose that an attempt were made to combine the two narratives into one, what confusion would necessarily result! Man would have to stand both at the beginning of the creation and at the end; besides, the man would have to be the first creation, and the woman the last; moreover, man would stand first, and yet man *and* woman would be created last, inasmuch as they were created male and female on the sixth day; the vegetable and animal kingdoms would have both to precede man and at the same time to follow him. The interweaving of the two accounts into a single narrative would be an impossible achievement.

Or can we say that P is an account of creation in general, while J is an account of special subsequent creations. But nothing can be clearer than that the order of creation in P is chronological and comes to its final completion on the sixth day. God, on beholding the work of each successive day, pronounces it "good"; it is only at the close of the sixth day that he pronounces everything he had made "very good." The heavens and earth were finished and God entered upon his Sabbathic rest. That excludes the idea of any later creations. Beside, the objects created are the same in P and J—vegetation, the animals, man and woman.

There can be no reasonable doubt, then, that these discrepancies and contradictions between the two narratives of creation are real, not merely fancied. No candid mind, unwarped by prejudice, can fail to see and acknowledge them, when once they are pointed out. Is anything to be gained by closing the eyes to these patent, but unwelcome facts? Is it wise, in view of the general diffusion of knowledge, to attempt the reconciliation of the irreconcilable, merely in the interest of a tradition, however venerable, or of an antiquated dogmatic theory? Is it not a more prudent, at least a more honest, course to accept without hesitation facts that are undeniable, and then draw the unavoidable conclusion that two narratives, like those under present examination, so different in their



view of the whole movement and purpose of creation, as well as in language, style and religious conceptions, can be rationally explained only as the work of several authors?

And this is all the more necessary because, in studying the Pentateuch, we meet with numerous other such duplicate narratives, sometimes standing in immediate succession, sometimes separated by a greater or less interval, and sometimes interwoven into one continuous story. Whoever, on the *a priori* presupposition of unity of authorship, feels compelled in each case to harmonize these conflicting stories will be constantly, and often consciously, forced to do violence to his exegetical conscience. What a relief to such a burdened soul, when he can once so far break away from a false traditional opinion of the composition and structure of the Old Testament, as to admit, in the case of these double narratives, a plurality of authors, differing in their views of the same subjects, as the creation, the deluge, the lives of the patriarchs, the history of Moses, writing in different styles and employing different terms for the same ideas!

Now, when we closely scrutinize and compare the later double narratives with the earliest—the two stories of creation—we make the remarkable discovery that one member of each duplicate has strong affinities with the P story of creation, the other member with the J story. The distinctive characteristics of each reappear. In the P members the designation for God is Elohim throughout Genesis up to Exodus, VI: 2-5, a duplicate of Ex. III: 9-15, in both of which narratives the name Jahveh (Jehovah, LORD) is for the first time revealed; while in the J members the name Jahveh is employed from the beginning (Gen. II: 4, LORD, substituted for Jahveh). The mode of thought and representation in the P members are very marked, and widely different in these respects from the J members. The P members have many peculiar words and phrases never found in the J members, and conversely. These assertions can be proved only by a critical analysis of

the Pentateuch, which, of course, is out of the question in a brief paper.

The modern critical theory of the Pentateuch rests upon such evidence as we have been setting forth, of which, indeed we have given but a very small part. It is the gradual outgrowth of minute and careful investigation made by many of the ablest biblical scholars in the century and a half since Astruc (1753). To-day it is very generally regarded in the scientific world as the most satisfactory solution of the difficult complicated problems arising out of the structure of the Pentateuch. We can present it here only in brief outlines. It holds that the Pentateuch is of a composite character, a compilation from four originally independent and continuous documents. The oldest, as a large majority of the critics think, is designated J, the first letter of the divine name Jahveh, which the writer always employs for God, but which is given in our English version by LORD in small capital letters. Its birth place was most probably Judah, and its date not earlier than 850 B. C. The next oldest document is designated E, the initial of Elohim, as the writer always names God before Ex. III, where he records the origin of the name Jahveh. This document was written in the northern kingdom, about a century later than J (750 B. C.). J and E are parallel prophetic narratives, akin in thought, style and language, yet with certain marked differences that prove them to be the work of several authors. At a later period, about 640 B. C., they were combined by an editor into a single work, J E, so skillfully that it is often impossible to say whether a passage is to be referred to J or E, owing to the absence of characteristics of either document. The original Deuteronomy, designated D, was discovered in the year 621 B. C., having been written a short time before. After having been enlarged by editors writing at various times in the style and spirit of Deuteronomy, it was combined with J E in the first half of the Exile. The last document, parallel to J and E, and, like E, naming God Elohim prior to Ex. VI, where the

name Jahveh is again revealed, is partly narrative, but chiefly devoted to ritual legislation. Its birthplace was Babylonia, where it was gradually compiled by priestly writers during and after the exile. From the character of its legislation it is named the Priests' Code, and is designated P. Not later than 400 B. C., it was combined with J E D, resulting in the complete Pentateuch as it has been transmitted to us.

This may seem to the reader highly improbable, because so complicated. He may even be inclined to smile at it as absurd. Yet perhaps he has seen a Harmony of the Gospels in which the four are interwoven into one continuous narrative. That is an almost exact parallel to the Pentateuch, compiled as it is in a similar way from four documents. At all events, the theory is the result of long and laborious study, not by idiotic cranks, but by serious minded scholars in earnest search for the truth and specially qualified to investigate the difficult questions involved. They assure us that, if we deal honestly with the given facts, such a theory is necessary to account for the Pentateuch in its present form; and their judgment is at least worthy of respect.

## II.

### COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

BY A. E. TRUXAL, D.D.

We wish to say at the very beginning of this paper that in common with Christians of all ages we believe Christianity to differ essentially from all other religions among men; and that Jesus Christ is different in person and life from all other founders of religion. There is consequently an important sense in which a comparison between Christianity and other religions cannot properly be instituted. In this view of the case Jesus of Nazareth and the religion which bears His name stand separate and alone. They can neither be strengthened and supported, nor weakened or destroyed by any existing relation that obtains between them and other teachers and systems of faith.

Another observation we wish to make in this connection is this, namely, that Christianity is not to be maintained by any evidence or proof that may be adduced in its favor from without. The Christian religion bears its proof within itself. The evidences of Christianity gathered from without its own bosom do not amount to very much in the end. The only unanswerable evidence of Christianity is and evermore must be the CHRISTIAN. Let the faith and doctrine of Christ produce Christians and that will place Christianity on an impregnable foundation. The Christian religion must prove itself by what it is and accomplishes. But is there not an historical argument, good and strong, that may be set up in its favor? And are there not miracles that can be used as the most convincing evidence in support of the divine origin of the Christian religion? Yes, there are historical facts in the form of conditions and events and results that may be discovered and

investigated and set forth in strong array in favor of our holy Christianity. And there are miracles that may be maintained as they have been by evidence that is hard to overcome. But the trouble is that Confucianism, Zoroastrianism and Buddhism can support and defend themselves by historical arguments too. And they can marshal before us a list of miracles in favor of their several religions. So that our arguments drawn from history and miracles are checkmated by their arguments of the same kind. We do not mean to imply that this field of inquiry and study ought to be abandoned, nor that our arguments are not better founded than theirs. It can be shown, we think, beyond a doubt that the history of Christianity is of a more real and reliable character than that of any other religion and that much more of the superstitious and mythical elements are connected and woven in with the other religions than with Christianity. Let these departments be explored and investigated and argued. The Christian religion need not fear the result. But our contention is that the evidence and proof of Christianity must in the end lie within itself. It must authenticate itself by what it is and accomplishes. It must, as it also does, substantiate its claim by its own life and fruits. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

But the representatives of other religions claim that by this test heathenism does not suffer; for they hold that a good heathen is just as good morally as a Christian, that just as many virtues adorn his character. And that may be true. But the good heathen is the exception rather than the rule. When the heathen as a body are taken into consideration they fall far below the Christian masses in respect of moral and spiritual purity. Vice, immorality and corruption exist in most advanced heathen society in a degree that would not be possible in enlightened Christian communities. Heathenism is dark and dreary and foul when viewed in the light of Christian civilization. Christian congregations and churches have not yet indeed reached the high standard of the Gospel of

Jesus Christ; but much less have the heathen actualized the principles and doctrines of their religious teachers. There is an element in heathen religions that has a tendency to degrade their devotees, whereas Christianity is elevating in its influence and effects and its followers are ever being raised to higher stages of morality and purity both as individuals and organized communities. Christianity has proven itself a true religion, and will do so ever more and more.

What is true of Christianity in general is in like manner true of the Bible as a particular element in it. The Bible must authenticate itself and prove itself to be true. The discussion of its superiority over the literature of other religions will not avail much. Arguments in favor of its inspiration, infallibility, and authenticity will not increase its value and strength, and arguments opposed to these features of it will not injure it. Hence we need not be alarmed by critics of any kind. The Bible produced by the church, written by men and handed down from age to age in a regular human way is a proper subject for study and investigation. Let it receive the study and discussion of earnest, pious and learned men, of friends and of enemies alike. Nothing but good can come out of such a procedure in the end. For the Bible will remain what it in reality is and will carry with it its own inherent life and spirit and will accomplish its own gracious purposes. That which is valuable in it is from beyond man. Man can neither create nor destroy it. He may be able to detect inaccuracies in it; he may point out legendary and mythological elements in it; he may discover the fragmentary character of some of the books of it; he may show that we have been mistaken as to the authorship of some of the writings. But what of that? It need not worry us. The Bible will remain what it is and will continue to exert a power for good in enlightening, guiding, purifying and inspiring the children of men. It bears within itself its own vindication and justification and will forever be its own proof.

But all this now is no reason why the Bible ought not be

compared with the sacred literature of other religions and they with it, nor why Christianity ought not be studied in the light of past and existing religions of the world, and they in the light of Christianity. It may be said that the Christian religion is of such high and superior character that it cannot receive any help from inferior forms of faith and piety; that the glory of the sun is not revealed by any light from the moon, but that the moon is revealed by the light of the sun. But that is a misconception of the relation which all the religions of the world sustain to each other. The truth of the case is better illustrated by another fact. Man is much superior to the animal. He is endowed with reason and will and it is not. He can know and understand, believe and worship, and it cannot. And yet the study of the animal is very helpful to a knowledge of man. A thorough knowledge of the anatomy and physiology of the animal is a great aid to the proper understanding of human physiology and anatomy. One of the branches taught in medical schools is comparative anatomy. And our psychologists investigate and study the instinct of animals as a help to a correct understanding of the nature and operations of the faculties of the human soul. And on the other hand, our knowledge of the human being enables us the better to understand the true character of animal life. In like manner is the study of comparative religion helpful, yes, we may say necessary, to a complete and accurate knowledge of Christianity. The relation between the Christian and other religions is closer and more intimate than that between man and the animal. The difference between them is not so great; they stand much more on the same plane. In the first place all heathen religions are in their essence very much alike. There is a difference between them, it is true, but a great similarity too. Hence in order to a proper understanding of heathenism it is necessary to hold all the different forms of it up side by side, and to view each one separately first and then in its relation to all others. Only then can we see and understand each one in its own true light. In the second



place a relation exists also between Christianity and heathenism as a whole. There are some things that the heathen religions possess in common with the Christian religion. There are points too where the Christian religion differentiates from all other religions. Consequently here again a comprehensive and correct understanding of any religion, the Christian included, demands a knowledge of all religions. The study of comparative religion is a necessity in order to a correct conception of Christianity. The individual person cannot understand himself excepting in the light of his knowledge of other individuals. No race of men can understand itself properly excepting in the light of its knowledge of other races. And no religion can become fully self-conscious save in the comparison of itself with other religions. Hence Christianity has nothing to lose but in the end everything to gain by the investigation and study of the religions of the world.

There were some earnest Christians who were filled with fear and trembling when the parliament of religion was held in Chicago in connection with the World's Fair in 1893. They believed that to give such recognition to the religions of the world would work injury to the cause of Christianity; that the Christian religion would be compromised by being placed on the same platform on an equality with other religions; that it was an unnecessary elevation of the false and an unjustifiable lowering of the true religion; that Christianity ought not to allow itself to be placed on the level with the world religions. But to our mind the fear expressed was unfounded.

In the first place Christianity ought not to be afraid to have other religions placed by its side, and to be placed there in their most favorable light by their ablest representatives. Christianity will thus be challenged to show forth its superiority in every way over all other forms of religious teachings and practices. It can do so and will do so. If it were unable to demonstrate and prove itself of the greatest value to the children of men it would not be worthy the place it seeks to

occupy. If it is to be the one catholic religion of mankind it must be able to show to all honest minds and longing hearts that it can justify its claims by its own inherent value. And our faith in it convinces us that it will do so. In the second place in our opinion we have passed that stage of the world when any religion can establish and maintain its superiority by assuming a high and separate position and refusing to fellowship with any or all others. There are some Christian sects that endeavor to do that. They claim that they are the only true church, that they have the true doctrine and true everything, that the Bible and history and everything else is with them, and consequently they will have no religious association with others, on the basis that light can have no fellowship with darkness. But that is in the present day regarded as bigotry, and the modern world is not disposed to pay any attention to such claims. The spirit of the age demands that anything that claims the adherence and devotion of men shall come out into broad daylight and be examined on all sides and in all relations, and further that any interest shall have the liberty of proclaiming its cause without persecution or oppression. Christianity consequently must allow all other religions the right of presenting their claims to the world on an equal basis with itself; and its duty and privilege then is so to commend itself to the minds and hearts of honest men and women that they will recognize in it that which they need for their "only comfort in life and death."

Besides, whatever may be the wish of the defenders of the Christian religion in the matter, the teaching and claims of other religions will gain the attention of the world. During the last fifty years the scholars of the west have had access to the religious and philosophical literature of the east, and the sacred books of Confucianism, Zoroastrianism and Buddhism have been translated into the languages of Christendom, and their teachings are gradually becoming known on all sides. Comparative religion is more and more becoming one of the studies in Christian universities and theological semi-

naries. Besides a large field of investigation and a fruitful source of knowledge have been opened up in these latter days by the excavations of the archaeologists along the Tigris and Euphrates. The religion of the Assyrians who were earlier and contemporaneous with the Israelites is being discovered and set forth as never before. Their literature is found to be closely allied in language and contents to the literature of the Hebrews. When these writings were first brought to light Christians generally rejoiced because many things in them were regarded as corroborating and confirming facts and events recorded in the Old Testament. Latterly, however, some who are wedded to traditional views of long standing are becoming alarmed, because it is being shown that many things which it had been believed the Jews had received by revelation they had derived from the religion of their neighbors in the East. Evidence is being adduced going to show that many of the Jewish religious and ethical ideas, ceremonies and institutions existed in the world previous to their incorporation in the Jewish system. This requires a change and modification of views about the Bible; and such changes are very repulsive to some minds and hearts and cause them much pain. But Christianity is bound to reckon with the principles and theories of heathenism, both ancient and modern. It must do so not only on the mission field but also among the educated and cultured of the home church.

Further, the knowledge of the teachings of the founders of the various religions of ancient and modern times has exerted an influence and produced effects upon Christian theological thought. The study of comparative religion has modified the views on some theological subjects. And it will no doubt continue to do so in time to come. Theological thought can no longer be confined to the narrow grooves in which it once moved. The barriers are breaking down and a larger scope is given to its view. Various subjects have become broadened and a more comprehensive grasp of them is demanded. A new condition has arisen and Christian theology is called into living

action striving to adjust itself to this condition. And in doing so it is led to abandon some of its former tenets, to modify others and assume new positions. This is no disparagement to theology but a credit; it does not indicate a weakness but shows its strength. Its life and essence remain and become larger and stronger, but its outward form and manifestation are changed to suit the new requirements. The Bible remains the same, as strongly intrenched in the truth which it contains as ever, but our views of its nature and purpose have become changed under our wider knowledge of the religious literature of the world. The idea that the heathen religions were the creations of the devil, that their founders were inspired by the evil spirit, and that the religions themselves are the instruments in the devil's hands for the accomplishment of his diabolical purpose in the destruction of the souls of men is given up. The heathen world was regarded the devil's world. But that view is largely abandoned now. Confucius, Zoroaster, Buddha and others were not bad men. Their lives and teaching show them to have been good men. It is too paradoxical to say that they were the agents of the devil and yet proclaimed and inculcated systems of philosophy and morality of so high order. When we remember the early ages in which they lived and the moral, social and political condition of the world in those times we are rather led to believe that they were enlightened by the spirit of God to grasp and proclaim truths so far in advance of their day. Their teachings were not evil but good in their time. Consequently the heathen world is still in the hands of God and under His government and guidance. We may not be able to grasp His purpose in regard to it. His ways are past finding out. But if the law was a schoolmaster leading the Jews to Christ may it not be the case that the heathen religions are also in their way schoolmasters to lead the people eventually to Christ? They may do so by becoming effete. They may do so by the production of evil fruit. It is a fact that the morality of heathen nations is of a very low order. It falls far below

the standard set by their teachers. Of course that is the case with Christian nations too. Even the church people come far short of actualizing the standard of the Gospel. But the people of Christian nations seem to be growing gradually upward towards their standard, whereas the people of heathen nations seem to be growing downward and away from their standards. Uninfluenced by outside forces, wickedness and vice seem to become more prolific and luxuriant on their soil from age to age. And this shows that notwithstanding the many good features of their systems of faith and doctrine there must be some essential elements lacking in them. There must be vital defects. And the moral degradation into which the people have been led may be their preparation for the Gospel of Jesus Christ. And hence the call comes to the people of God with great force in this age of the world to prosecute their missionary operations among the heathen. Failing to do so may be their failure to work in with the plans of their Lord and bring them under His condemnation. We believe that the Lord God means to accomplish some wise and gracious purpose by the remnant of Israel scattered throughout the world by leading them through various paths in His own mysterious way; and we believe also that He will accomplish some great good for His kingdom in the world by suffering the heathen to work out their destiny in their own free way, though not independent of His overruling providence.

Thus we see that Christian theology must widen its scope, broaden its views, and adjust itself from generation to generation to the new conditions that arise, in the new light that is revealed. Our faith and hope and trust in God increases from day to day. We believe in God, in the Gospel, and in the truth with an immovable conviction, and are sure they will in the end prevail. Investigation, discovery, study and criticism of every kind and character are but the pains and travail accompanying the birth of the truth into the minds and hearts of men and into the life of the world; and they are all efficiently helpful in the establishment of God's kingdom upon earth.

### III.

#### DR. NEVIN AND THE BIBLE.

BY REV. A. R. KREMER, D.D.

The Nevin centennial, this year, is a fact, and one that should be honored and celebrated everywhere in the Reformed Church. But almost nothing has been done in that direction. Attention was called to it in the *Reformed Church Messenger* early in the year, and this was followed by a brief article from a correspondent, and there the matter seemed to end. If hundreds of pulpits and platforms since the twentieth of last February resounded with eloquence on the man who had no peer, I have seen no evidence of it. I do not hesitate to say that the General Synod, the district synods and classes of the Reformed Church should have inaugurated and organized public demonstrations in commemoration of the man and his work, a man and work that stand out in such conspicuous prominence that to fail to honor them at such auspicious time is to neglect the inspired admonition to "remember them who have spoken to us the word of God."

Centennial celebrations are in excellent order. Our older people have not forgotten the lively centenary movement of 1846, and the ter-centenary of 1863; and even young men and maidens remember the centennial of '93, and the sesqui-centennial of '96; and memory is not taxed in regard to the semi-centennial of F. and M. College. Equal in importance to any of these is that which is now upon us. A century ago Dr. John W. Nevin was born. Other people were born the same year, 1803. Distinguished among them, and worthy of special commemoration, is Ralph Waldo Emerson, and more has been written and spoken about him during the few months of the present year than he himself ever wrote or

spoke. The daily papers and magazines have been teeming with observations on the man and his literary productions. All right, too. And yet perhaps some have timidly asked themselves what great thing Emerson did for mankind with his voice and pen that were not equally well done by hundreds of others, for whose memory no fatted calf has been killed, and before whose image none have danced. Will any intelligent up-to-date member of the Reformed Church, one who is familiar with both Emerson and Nevin, say that the latter's centennial is not more important than that of the former? Between the two men comparison can be made favorable to both; and yet, as the eagle to the sparrow, so is Nevin to Emerson, and no detraction from the merits of the latter is here thought of. A splendid volume could be written on Emerson as an essayist, poet and philosopher, ranking him high in each department named, without so much as reaching the vestibule of the temple in which Nevin was master.

There is a class of men who, favored by wealth and corresponding environment, have attained to eminence in linguistic, literary and general culture through constant application of carefully selected and costly means to such end, but who have not made any great impression upon other minds, because there is commonly in such persons a personality not strictly their own; they are machine-made, interesting productions, in many instances, useful and important in their way and eminent as a class, yet seldom rising to real individual fame, and passing away are soon forgotten. As a mere illustration compare certain highly cultured statesmen, who had enjoyed from childhood all the advantages just referred to, with certain other statesmen who forged ahead over mountains of difficulties, from the backwoods log cabin on up to the highest station, moved only or chiefly by an inborn mighty energy and genius and high moral purpose. The former will live in moth-eaten books, if at all, the latter never die, and continue through the ages to direct the minds of men.



Dr. Nevin in his youth was not without advantages. His parentage was first class, in the best sense of the word. His father was a first-honor college graduate. He was of good stock and blood, and he is another of the many proofs that "blood will tell." This may seem like placing him with that highly polished manufactured class, educated as a matter of course, taken through the academic mill *nolens volens*, as the proper thing for one of his kind, and necessary for the maintenance of the family dignity. And so it might be said that his brilliant college and theological seminary career can be explained by such relationship and educational environment. For instance, at the age of twenty-three he had completed his theological course at Princeton. That in itself was nothing remarkable; but it *was* remarkable that he graduated a profound theologian, and more remarkable still, as a thorough Hebrew scholar. Who ever heard, before or since, of an underseminary graduate reading during a three years' course every word of the Hebrew Bible carefully and critically, and making himself master of it? He was not required to read and study more than a few chapters here and there—as heavy a cross as most students are able to bear. As proof of his thoroughness, he was appointed teacher of the Hebrew language and literature during the two years' absence in Europe of Dr. Hodge. Here was a youth not far out of his teens not only filling that important chair with great ability, but—*mirabile dictu*—finding time during those two years to write two volumes on "Biblical Antiquities," a work that soon became known and popular in Great Britain as well as in America. Then, as further proof of his ability, at the age of twenty-five he was chosen professor of Hebrew and Old Testament literature in the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny, and for ten years he was the light of that institution. But let us see whether those brilliant attainments, at so early age, are to be accounted for by the accidents of wealth and station.

Certainly not; though his advantages were undoubtedly just what such a nature most needed, but were not the kind

that are at hand in the houses of princes, lords and millionaires. He was reared in a farm-house; his most visible environments were broad acres, woodlands and mountains. The music most familiar to him came from the many-tongued warblers of the air, in solo or chorus, and from the babbling streams that leaped through fields and over rocks. He was familiar with the implements of husbandry, not as the son of a manor lord, proprietor of a vast landed estate operated by subordinate bosses and common hirelings, himself as son and heir passing the intervals between study hours following his tutors and hounds in the chase, or indulging in other fashionable sports. No, his father, learned as he was, practised his rural profession just as his neighbors did, minus their unscientific ways, and plus the application of his superior knowledge to the art of farming, and his son performed his full part in the work according to his years and strength. His hands were not the soft velvety ornaments of a city lad, but nature's instruments of practical usefulness. Of course mind was not neglected on that farm. Farm work itself was there an aid to mental discipline and development. Brawn and brain wrought together without friction in the formation of a full all-round personality. That farm-house was a domestic institution of learning of which the owner was principal. The gymnasium covered fields and groves, all under one roof—"sub ætheris axe." From this rural family academy young Nevin graduated at the age of fourteen, when he entered Union College, N. Y., which he left four years later as an honored alumnus, a youth of eighteen years. Full of all the learning the college could give, but broken in health, he spent two years on his father's farm, and his impaired constitution was restored. Then at twenty he entered the theological seminary, and the rest has been told.

Thus we have taken a summary view of the first twenty-five years of this remarkable man's career. We have seen him a successful teacher in a noted school of the prophets, the incumbent for two years of one of the most important and

difficult departments in it, to which he was appointed immediately after his graduation, and an author the value of whose works was recognized by the learned of two continents. Making due account of the advantages he had—a godly, learned and wise father, and an equally excellent mother—nevertheless the fact remains that he lived before entering college in a rural community of plain and simple-minded people, and nine years later on (two of which he spent on the farm for physical benefit), at the age of twenty-three he occupied a position which we can associate only with a man of distinguished ability. Taking all these facts of Dr. Nevin's early life into consideration, we must conclude that here was a chosen vessel, one of the race of earth's mighty men, of the class of Moses, Elijah, and Paul. His subsequent history affords abundant proof that there are no great names in the annals of the human race too great for association with his. He is one of the half dozen of the world's greatest leaders.

Constrained by an official call and clear indications of Providence Dr. Nevin passed into the old historic Reformed Church; and it soon became apparent that his coming was a home coming. Here he saw an open door, where he found the elements at least and possibilities of a living and growing theology. In the Reformed Church he found what he had long desired, a freer theological atmosphere than that from which he came, where he could throw off the shackles of a traditional theology, as fixed in all its features as an Egyptian mummy, and held to with a tenacity born of a long-established accepted orthodoxy. He readily discovered in the Reformed Church, enslaved as it was by the reigning sentiment, a willingness to hear something else than the old Puritanic song and refrain. His new disciples' minds and hearts were responsive to the new voice, for they recognized it as their own calling them from the strange pastures into which they had wandered. The new teacher shook the dry bones which at his touch took on flesh and blood and stood up a live army. His own place was then securely fixed in the midst of

a tribe of Israel that was to stand henceforth for truth wherever found, especially as contained in the Holy Scriptures now cleared of much of the traditional dust that had gathered on their pages and obscured their sacred meaning.

I have dwelt somewhat on Dr. Nevin's first work as a Christian teacher during that remarkable period of two years at Princeton, because it has much bearing on the subject in hand: "Dr. Nevin and the Bible."

It is worthy of note that he began his life work as a public instructor in the Holy Scriptures. To that work he bent all his best energies, and for its accomplishment employed all his great talents and learning. His knowledge of physics, history, languages and philosophy he made tributary to the gaining and disseminating of the truth contained in the Bible. What does the Bible teach? was the question he endeavored to answer; and the arts, sciences, humanities, embraced in what men call education, he regarded as servants to aid in the search after the truth of which Christ spoke when He said to Pilate: "For this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth." It is certain that his mind was deeply impressed by that royal word from Christ, as it is certain that in all his teaching he sought to bear the same witness. For two years in his early manhood, judging from the labor he performed, he must have concentrated all his best thoughts on the sacred Scriptures; so that the Bible was from the very beginning of his public career his *vade mecum*, the lamp to his feet and the light to his path. Then for two more years, while waiting for his new appointment to be made ready for him, he preached, as occasion called, to promiscuous assemblies in school houses, private dwellings and churches, thus putting to practical use the results of his Biblical studies. Then again for ten years, as theological professor, the Bible was his text-book and furnished the subjects of his lectures to students; and during that decade he rose to fame as one of the most distinguished lights in the field of Biblical science.

So it may be said with some truth that Dr. Nevin was a

"man of one book," and yet by no means in the sense in which the phrase is commonly understood. His learning was general, covering the whole domain of knowledge, but centered in the truth as it is in Christ, to whom all the Holy Scriptures bear witness. Before his intellectual and spiritual vision all things were illuminated by the Spirit of Christ, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." The word of God was to him the literary fountain, principle and measure of all sacred truth, the highest verbal expression of the living and personal Truth, Jesus Christ Himself.

It is a blessed thing that while the highest knowledge is hid from the worldly wise and prudent it is revealed unto babes; and it is also a blessed thing that God raises up men that are not babes, or mere innocents, but mighty to increase, instruct and lead the hosts of God toward the final victory over all that is opposed to the truth to which Christ bore witness. Thus poised and centered Dr. Nevin launched out into the deep, and the thinking and progressive part of Christendom know what he drew forth to land. He could not be misled by appearances, even in the Bible itself; the human language through which divine truth was conveyed to men he did not regard as perfect, and to be received therefore always with absolute literalness, as if the words came directly from the mouth of God. He searched the Scriptures with the understanding that God inspired not words, not letters, but *men*. He of course paid close attention to the letter and everything pertaining to the language and history of the Bible. He was a master of hermeneutics, and skilled in the use of all the apparatus in linguistic art, which he used for all they were worth; but he never allowed them the position of master, and he therefore never bowed before the mere letter of the Bible, as a heathen before a fetish, nor was he bound and fettered by the chains of a hoary traditionalism, however "time-honored" and respectable. He accepted the Bible as containing the substance of what men should know, and as the only fundamental literary medium by which God communi-

cated with fallible human beings. Guided by the spirit of all truth, just as were apostles and prophets of old, he saw beneath the surface of the imperfect letter what no literalist and no traditionalist could see. Moss-grown theories built upon "texts" here and there, which were supposed to settle forever the doctrine in question, he often found to be in flat contradiction of the whole tenor and teaching of the Scriptures as apprehended from a sound basis, and in the true spirit of prophecy. He saw with wonderful clearness that any interpretation of Scripture was defective, and even false, that had not Christ, His person and doctrine, as its interpreter at every point; not any single doctrine concerning Him, or which He was supposed to have taught, but Christ Himself, the way, the truth and the life. Only in the light of Christ could the Scriptures be rightly understood, for they testify of Him.

Under this powerful searchlight Dr. Nevin read and studied the Bible. No one needs be told that if he attempts to do a piece of work in the dark he will at least partially fail; that if a child learning to write follows his own poor lines instead of the perfect copy set for him he will come to grief; that if a child's only Christian instruction is by a teacher whose knowledge of the Bible is confined to a list of its narratives he will grow up as one of the many semi-pagans in a Christian land. So, too, there may be a period in the onward movement of the Christian ages when Bible study is fostered with uncommon zeal; many expedients are sought out as aids in disseminating Bible truth; comments, pictures and diagrams come thick as autumn leaves—but, like the prophetic leaves of the Sibyl of Cumæ, they are apt to be wafted apart by any passing breeze, losing their connection and failing to direct the soul to the living Fountain, to Him who said: "If any man thirst, let him come to Me and drink." So the work proceeds, and many people imagine that the light of divine truth is spreading through such means as in no other way. And yet—if the present is the supposed period—it is doubt-

ful whether the results bear anything like a fair proportion to the outlay. What is the character of the teaching? For the most part it is, at best (with, of course, many bright exceptions), teaching moral lessons from the Bible without regard to what makes the Bible what it is, that is, without reference to the Kingdom of God, and the Church which is its visible and living expression, the mystical body of Christ who is Head over all. Surely when people in the reading of the Scriptures do not see Christ in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks (Rev. I: 20), they grope in darkness, even if they are familiar with the whole Gospel history. Dr. Nevin knew no Bible apart from "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." Christ is in the midst of her, as the Light of the World.

As an illustration of Dr. Nevin's comprehensive view of the Bible in the light of "Christ and the Church," or Christ in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, I know of none better than his review of Dr. Hodge's commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. According to certain passages in the Epistle it seems plain enough that St. Paul's argument establishes the old and almost universally received doctrine on the divine decrees on to the time of the Reformation, held by large bodies of Christians ever since, and occupying a central place in their confessions of faith. Nothing should seem farther from "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God," which is so full of loving offers of salvation to all men, than what Calvin himself confessed was "horribile decretum," and yet St. Paul seems to teach it in Ephesians and elsewhere, in language so positive that for ages few of the orthodox ventured to antagonize or explain it away. But, although Dr. Nevin was born and reared in the thickest atmosphere of Calvin's decretal system, his great mind could not be forever imprisoned by clouds, but, as in the case of Troy's greatest prince "*Scindit se nubes, et in æthera purgat apertum.*" His profound studies in the Bible opened to him avenues that led him far into the depths of divine



truth, and far beyond the settled convictions of that large and respectable class of theologians whose views he had shared during his earlier years. His review of Dr. Hodge's commentary, while giving it full credit as a learned and highly respectable production, a work wrought out with great dialectic skill, its logic and conclusions, from the premises taken, secure as the everlasting hills, showed how Biblical misconceptions, in other words, false interpretations, have their day, no matter how firmly they may be rooted in the minds of men, or even in the general mind of the Church itself. But *Truth* has its day on which the sun never sets: it is contained in holy Scripture, not easily disorned in all its glorious meaning, on account of the imperfection and limited powers of men. But as God raised up a Moses and others to be lights in the world's dark ages, so He chose in these latter days of intense civilization men for the time, and this one man especially to call down from lofty thrones the mitred conceits long swaying the minds of men—and now to attack the very citadel of orthodoxy as maintained by a powerful and influential branch of the Christian Church; and planting himself squarely on Holy Scripture he appeals to it alone, and with that weapon demolishes utterly the argument that Paul's leading thought and purpose in writing the Epistle was to teach the Church and the world that God, without why or wherefore, except for His own *pleasure*, elected, appointed and fashioned certain of mankind for redemption and salvation, and all others for eternal destruction, thus contradicting His own most solemn oath that He takes *no pleasure* in the ruin of any human soul. And, be it known, that Dr. Nevin had no sectarian interest in view in presenting his argument, as if, for example, he was defending Arminianism against Calvinism. It was with him simply and purely a Biblical question; and his review of Hodge was a refutation of the position that the Epistle to the Ephesians taught the Calvinistic doctrine of election and a limited atonement. Whatever theory on the subject he himself advanced he drew

from the Epistle. With him it was: "Speak, Lord, and thy servant heareth," and he heard quite a different voice from that which a preoccupied mind is sure to hear when it sets itself to make the divine oracles utter its own darling shibboleths. And the result to Christendom of Nevin's review of Hodge, if it were generally read and studied, would be a new Epistle to the Ephesians, the old cleared of moss-grown traditions, showing God's fatherly countenance in the face of Jesus Christ—not a severe sovereign Majesty handing over to His Incarnate Son a fixed number of the human race arbitrarily chosen for redemption, but a loving and gracious Father as revealed in Christ and in the mystery of His Bride, the Church.

In that masterly review Dr. Nevin did the Church and mankind a service that has been of great benefit to the Reformed communion, but of its effect elsewhere I cannot speak. If some liberal-hearted and enlightened Dives would have it reprinted, stereotyped, bound in best style and sent free to at least every minister of the Calvinistic faith in America, he would do a far better service than if he would establish and endow a public library. Every clerical reader of the neat gift would find in it the golden key to the meaning of all that is written in the Bible on the divine decrees, in the Epistle to the Ephesians especially. Unless his mind were hopelessly biased, he would no longer see Dr. Hodge's golden thread (say tyrant's chain) of predestination running through that apostolic epistle from beginning to end; but rather he would listen to the sweetest notes in the song of God's fatherly love to all mankind. Then the children's cry for bread—I mean the oft repeated call for relief from the no longer bearable sight of Damocles' sword—for the removal from an authoritative confession of faith of the monstrous absurdity, that God, infinite in love and mercy, effectually calls only those whom He from eternity had chosen to eternal life, and that, too, without reference to anything foreseen in them; this cry, I say would be answered, not by simply, or for the most part,

substituting milder terms for the bristling dagger points in the confession, a gentler poison but as sure to kill, but rather by casting out the whole decretal system as taught for at least fifteen centuries, and all through failure to distinguish between the mere letter and the spirit of the sacred writings. Will some earnest soul resurrect Dr. Nevin's great classic and give it a chance to throw a flood of light into a very dark place, now that some weak efforts are made to undo a wrong for ages inflicted upon the souls of innocent people?

No need for better proof that Dr. Nevin was neither a literalist nor traditionalist. His writings prove indeed that he stood squarely on the settled ground principles of Christianity as embodied in the œcumenical creeds, but he knew how to distinguish between foundations and superstructures. The immobility of the one does not necessarily pertain to the other. To affirm otherwise is to indorse Romanism, to accept its chief and most comprehensive claim, and to abandon the whole ground on which protestantism must stand or fall. And one of the curious features in the howlings of fifty and more years ago is, that Dr. Nevin was charged with playing into the hands of Rome at the very time when he insisted on the principle of historical development as the sign and seal of a living and progressive over against a stagnant and petrified church. As far back as 1846 he expressed vigorous thought on this subject (see his introduction to Schaff's "*Principles of Protestantism*"), and much more in years following. He applied the same critical principle to the study of the Bible. There especially are the bed-rock principles that do not grow, just as the foundation of a building does not, only that which is built upon it. God's word, His written revelation to men, is of course perfect—"the law of the Lord is perfect" (Ps. 19)—but the language, even when spoken and written by men of the highest inspiration, is not the language of heaven, but of earth. Many a Scripture word has misled men who bow before the latter as a heathen before his idols. People of all sorts of pernicious beliefs ap-

peal to the Bible. First, they are sure the peculiar doctrines they profess are true; then they go to the Bible to prove the same to themselves and others, and they always, in their own opinion, succeed. The Bible can be readily made to fit any doctrine and satisfy every shade of belief, as if it had faces for every point of the compass. But of course it is not the Bible that can be charged with "every wind of doctrine," but men with minds warped by preconceived notions and pet theories, who live and move in their own diminutive world, which they complacently imagine is the universe. They handle the Bible as if it were a nose of wax, and twist it into any desired shape. Thus the supralapsarian says: "God is sovereign, the Bible so teaches"—and no one denies it—"therefore He saves whom He will, and whom He will He hardens and destroys. The Bible says God created some men for glory and honor, and others He fitted for destruction, just as a potter of the same lump of clay makes one vessel to honor and another to dishonor, as Paul declares." And that settles it, if Biblical literalism, supported by centuries of tradition, settles anything. Then of course it is "forever settled in heaven" that Christ did not come into the world as the Prince of Peace, no matter what the angels sang over Bethlehem, for himself declared, with ringing emphasis: "I came not to send peace on the earth, but a sword." What then should prevent literalists from advocating war, not only between nations, but even in families, and from regarding Christ as the realization of the mythical war god? But read Nevin on Hodge.

One more illustration of his treatment and study of the Bible. It is certainly remarkable—a curious psychical phenomenon perhaps—that so many protestants will not hear of any historical connection with the Church of Rome, and yet cling with the greatest tenacity to certain doctrinal theories that have come down to us from the Middle Ages, where they were conceived and born—ages supposed to be dark as Erebus—and in cloisters supposed to be dens of moral cor-

ruption. For instance, the mediæval theory of the atonement must not be questioned at a single point, except at the risk or religious ostracism. They first received it by tradition outside of the Bible, and then appealed to the Bible as witness to the truth of the theory, imagining all the while that they got it first and fresh from that source. In seeking Bible proof, a sentence, or only a word, is deemed sufficient. The doctrine that Christ was appointed a legal substitute to suffer and die in man's stead, that what He endured in such way was equivalent to what man would otherwise have to endure; that is, that God was willing to save sinners, but could not unless His Incarnate Son took the sinners' place and received the punishment as a primary and legal consideration; that then His justice being satisfied and His wrath appeased, He could justify and save all those included in the economy of redemption: such, briefly stated, is the outline of the doctrine. The one word that settled the matter beyond question was "propitiation," as used three times in the New Testament. If Christ was the propitiation for our sins, and the word in the New Testament is to be understood precisely as in the classic Greek from which it was borrowed, then the question is settled in favor of the doctrine just stated. But here again "the letter killeth." Propitiation is a well known word in the religious vocabulary of the ancient Greeks, and used to express the impression sought to be made on the mind of an offended or adverse deity by sacrifice; in which a sleek bull or heifer, or may be, a whole herd of them, might be required to appease the wrath of the god or goddess; and not infrequently a human sacrifice was demanded, and usually some one specially worthy, an honored citizen or a beautiful and beloved princess. Suppose the last named: She is gently led to the altar, by loving and sympathising attendants, not dishonored, beaten, and dragged to the place of sacrifice by a jeering mob; but, amid splendid religious ceremony and crowned with garlands she pours out her life's blood for the salvation of her royal father's kingdom. Thus she

dies as a propitiation for whatever the deity had charged as a debit against her people and nation. Now as St. Paul uses the same word, if his use of it is the same as in the classic Greek writers, then Christ was indeed a real substitute for a part of mankind at least, and fulfilled the condition on which the Father would be reconciled to men. God must have satisfaction, and Christ rendered it on the altar of the cross, just as the princess did on the pagan altar. When Jupiter from high Olympus, or *de vertice coeli*, saw the virgin's blood he was appeased, and the army was spared. He had his revenge—he was propitiated. So when God saw the blood of His Son He was appeased, and a part of the human race was saved. He had His revenge—He was propitiated! Stript of its useless verbiage, this fairly represents the doctrine that was generally regarded as the very corner-stone of orthodoxy.

But what a miserable conception of the great atonement. Dr. Nevin had no patience with the current views on the subject, as he showed in sermons, addresses and writings, notably a sermon on "Christ and Him Crucified," a "*concilio ad clerum*." His mind rose far above the literal sense of Scripture words that expressed purely pagan ideas, and he saw in them a new meaning as transferred by inspired apostles to Christian uses, and now transformed and glorified in the Kingdom of God. He had no hesitation in speaking of Christ as "the propitiation for our sins," but then only in what must be the Christian sense, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself; that Christ, the new Head of humanity, satisfied the divine justice, and restored men to righteousness by perfect obedience, even unto death. No man ever made more account of Christ's death on the cross than Dr. Nevin did; his contention was as to *the meaning* of the cross, that it was far more glorious and excellent than what the cold substitution theory could make it to be. His view of the cross was the result of his studies in the Scriptures, and not of blind submission to any authority outside of them; and in his rational and truly Scriptural view of it its glory shone

forth with a brightness that is totally wanting in the several popular theories held, differing among themselves only in name, whose only authority is tradition and a number of disconnected Scripture texts. He was not overawed by the reigning confessionalism many centuries old, for he owed a higher allegiance to the Bible than to any man-made or even church-made doctrinal theory. His principle of historical development he applied to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and he allowed no edict from either papal or protestant Rome to interfere with his right to draw his own conclusions from the teachings of God's word. Nor would he yield to any man in proper respect for tradition. He appealed to the church fathers, and to the consensus of faith in all periods of Christian history, but he knew no master except Christ and His word. In theology he regarded nothing as irrevocably fixed, except the fundamentals, and even these as subject to improved interpretations. He and Romanism, in this respect at least, were as far apart as the poles. Romanism admits of no variations, change or developments in Christian doctrine, and no distinction between essentials and non-essentials. It anathematizes one who dissents from the article that the estate of virginity is more holy than the estate of marriage as fiercely as one who denies Christ's divinity. Whoever expresses doubt as to the truth of papal infallibility, "let him be anathema," as certainly as if he announced himself an atheist. St. Paul says: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind"; but the Roman Church says, if his persuasion disagrees at a single point with Trent or the Vatican, "Anathema sit." The only difference here between the Roman and the protestant traditionalist is as to doctrine, both however holding the same principle, in which the Romanist is entirely consistent, but not so the other. The one stands squarely on the Roman principle, as applied to dogma and Holy Scripture; the other does the same thing, in that he surrenders his judgment and reason to protestant tradition, and reads the Scriptures through the eyes of the sect to which he belongs.



Dr. Nevin took the Bible as the Reformation gave it to him, and accepted its great formal principle that the Bible is the only supreme written rule of faith and practice, and rejected the doctrine that its right interpretation can be obtained only by the light thrown upon its pages by tradition, and yet with this he had no quarrel, not any more than with the seasons of the year or with the eclipses of sun and moon. Tradition is a great fact and a great study. It is inseparable from the history and development of Christian doctrine and the whole external and internal growth of Christ's kingdom. Without tradition the ages are a blank, and the human mind cut off from communion with past generations of mind can exist only in a state of barbarism. Dr. Nevin made all proper account of Christian tradition, and saw much in it that was helpful in the interpretation of Scripture, but he never acknowledged any infallible dictum from any source other than the divine word itself. Why should he? Who made Ambrose, Augustine, Anselm, Calvin, Luther and others more able than himself to interpret and teach the Bible? A sorry thing it would be indeed if every one would set himself up as a public interpreter of Scripture; and what folly has been wrought in Israel by such attempts, as witness the multiplicity of sects wasting time and energy over a few barren non-essentials, or, what is worse, turning the truth of God into a lie.\* But, like St. Paul himself, Dr. Nevin made full proof of his divine call as a teacher of sacred things, and had the right, therefore, to bring forth things new and old from the treasury of God's word. It was his duty, having the ability, to correct any errors of the past that he might discover, however venerable

\* The following passage from Dr. Nevin's writings is clear and to the point: "This is the order of thinking in which Luther so much abounds: the Bible the principle of Protestantism; but only the sense of the Holy Ghost in the Bible; and that again only as demonstrated to be actually there by the responsive apprehension of faith. These three together, the Bible in the element of the Divine Spirit, and faith having its existence and exercise in the same element. So only could there be any sense in the Protestant principle. The Bible, thrown open to private judgment in any other way, must become the sport forever of infidel rationalism in one direction and of wild fanaticism in another."

the tradition, and so bear witness to the truth. That is Protestantism, its opposite is Romanism, whatever else it may pretend to be. The one means gospel liberty, of which St. Paul speaks in glowing terms as one of the great inheritances of the saints; the other means bondage, chains and slavery—that is, Romanism, under whose *ipse dixit* the most rational and learned conclusions, and the most puerile and preposterous errors are dumped into the same waste-basket and their advocates blasted with the same bolt from the Vatican. By accepting the one we assert our right to think; submitting to the other we discard our reasoning faculties, lick the dust before the feet of machine-made human authority, or swear by the tenets of a school or sect.

There is no middle ground. We must either take the position so ably presented by Dr. Nevin, and thus be true to Protestantism, or accept all the dogmas and absurdities of the Roman Church.

The work of enlightenment will go on. From the inexhaustible store of truth in the Bible more light will proceed as the ages roll on; the sacred text will become better understood as the Church advances toward "the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ," Eph. IV: 13. To effect such glorious result God calls into service, in every period of human history, men qualified to be leaders of Christian thought, able to correct popular errors and hold forth the truth in all its saving power. One of the greatest of these was Dr. Nevin. The Reformed Church to-day wears his mantle (even if rather forgetful of his centennial), and, instead of moving in the narrow ruts of a few generations ago, traverses the whole field of truth, and sees in God's word immeasurably more than the mere letter which they that are not grounded in the truth often wrest to their own destruction. This church under such training, enjoys a freedom that can scarcely be found elsewhere; a theology that is not surrounded by a Chinese wall; a Bible that is not bound by scholastic or dogmatic chains, whether Roman or

protestant. This freedom is more than intellectual (which may be this or that), it is the freedom of the Spirit who, as we are taught by Christ, guides earnest souls into all truth.

The closing years of Dr. Nevin's life were to him the golden period of Bible study. The sacred volume, though he was familiar with it from childhood, and had sounded its deep places as few ever did or could, seemed now as transfigured before him in garments heavenly and glorious. The same Book still, but its inner sense, breaking through clouds and illuminating them, now appeared more and more luminous as he drew nearer and nearer to the line that separates earth and heaven. During the centennial of American Independence—at the close of the commencement exercises of F. and M. College—at the moment of his retirement from the institution as its head—an elegantly bound copy of the Bible was publicly presented to him, when he took occasion not only to gratefully acknowledge the kindly spirit which evidently prompted the donors, and the significance of the gift itself, but also to declare anew his testimony in regard to the inspired volume. He spoke for an hour, and though his address was of necessity without a moment's premeditation, yet if it had been printed word for word as spoken, it would have been preserved and cherished as a most valuable classic monograph on the Bible. Ten years yet remained to him, and most of his writings in that closing decade were profound utterances on the spiritual inner sense of God's word. This was his crowning work, this its golden fruit—

*"Hic labor extremus, longarum hæc meta viarum."*

His life presents many features, as he was at home in all departments of learning, great in all, but greatest in his mastery of the problems and mysteries of the Holy Bible.

We will not celebrate another centennial of Dr. Nevin; but if in A. D. 2003 our descendants will celebrate his bicentennial, it will be because the Reformed Church will have continued to prove herself worthy of such a man.

*"—— maneat nostros ea cura nepotes."*

#### IV.

### THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER—HIS OFFICE AND ITS IDEALS.

BY THE REV. A. S. WEBER, D.D.

*"The Rank is but the Stamp; the Man is the Gold."*

A distinguished biblical scholar of our day is the author of a remarkable essay on the rationale of the Christian preacher. He argues that the question "Why does he preach?" can be adequately answered neither by a reference to his sense of duty, nor by saying that it is Christ's command that he should do so. In the last analysis, he insists, the philosophical explanation of the preacher is that he is a man. The preacher's position as a member of that unity which we call the human race accounts for his enthusiasm and joy in proclaiming the "good tidings" to his fellow men, and supplies important conditions for the achievement of success in his purposes. The "gospel of the glory of the happy God," as an illustrious apostle in one of his ancient pieces of writing calls the divine message, quickens the feelings arising out of this position of the preacher. The function of the good news of God is not to cut new channels; it is rather to flood the languidly flowing currents in their old channels, to quicken them with fresh vitality and power, and to fill them up to the very brim with new purpose and aspiration.

For a time like our's which looks with not a little suspicion and prejudice upon the preacher and discounts especially the traditional claims of his office, this view of the rationale of the preacher, no doubt, has more significance than appears on the surface. Regarding both the man and his official rank from a somewhat unusual visual angle, it succeeds in showing the preacher's relations to be human, sym-

pathetic and attractive, rather than coldly professional, "other worldly" and repellant. The Christianity for which he pleads and in whose interests he labors, instead of abrogating human nature or attempting to foist upon it that which is foreign to its original design and genius, is discovered to be its supreme ennoblement, consecration and glory. The preacher who, being a Christian, is most a man, thus comes to be regarded not simply as the best preacher but also as the best friend ministering most disinterestedly to the world's deepest needs. Results like these as regards both the preacher himself and the cause commanding his devotion, cannot easily be placed at too high a value. For are there not many things in this unspiritual, skeptical, wealth-worshipping, pleasure-loving age which without this conception of himself and his work might well make the earnest preacher solicitous about the ultimate success of his labor if not disheartened in the arduous pursuit of it? With this conception, however, he and those to whom he comes with his message can readily see that no other work committed to man's doing on earth is so great in itself, so beneficent in its designs, so momentous in its purposes, so far-reaching in its scope, or so sure of accomplishing enduring effects as that in which he is engaged. Accordingly with reference to the final outcome of the mighty plans of God which are to be forwarded by the preaching of His Word, no one need be timidly faint-hearted or despairing. In the vision of the apocalyptic seer on Patmos the kingdoms of this world were become the kingdoms of God, and of His Christ, and the increasing purpose manifestly running through the ages is tending towards the realization of that prophetic vision—a realization to which the results of the preached Gospel are year by year contributing added volume and momentum.

In confirmation of this the achievements of preaching as recorded by history might be cited, and in their light and the reassurance to be had from them, the problems of to-day may be confidently met by the Christian preacher. If there are trends of thought and habits of life at present which make

his task eminently hard, the difficulties surely are not to be compared to those which the first ambassadors of Christ encountered and overcame. If there are philosophical and scientific tendencies in our times that offer strong resistance to the Gospel, they certainly present no such stubborn front as that which wisdom-seeking Greece did in the early centuries and over which the truth as it is in Jesus triumphed. If there are social questions raised by disputes between employers and employees which threaten the welfare of Church and State at the beginning of the twentieth century, they assuredly are not so formidable as those which earlier ages distracted by wars occasioned by class-hatred and race-prejudice, met and solved. If there are some aspects in the morals of our Western civilization antagonistic to the principles and precepts of the Gospel, so was the corruption which once honey-combed the luxurious sensualism of the East. If the secularizing influence of modern commerce and trade; if the spirit of wealth seeking to domineer over men and even nations in their right, is hostile to the progress of Christianity in this day, was the self-cultured pride of Rome with its cult of the Emperor less so? If there is most lamentable ignorance among large masses of our fellow men, is it more dense and unyielding than was the darkness and superstition of some of our forefathers in Northern Europe, or than that of pagans in other countries? And yet the message of the Gospel conquered in all these instances. Why despair of its power now? Is not the Gospel the same? Is not the divine power that always attends the duly accredited messenger the same? Is not He who commissions us to go into all the world to preach the Gospel, "yesterday, to-day and forever the same?" "Is the Spirit of the Lord straitened? Are these His doings?" Must we not, when Scripture puts questions such as the last to us, look to ourselves as preachers in order to find, if not wholly, very largely, the causes which, to the minds of many, have made the powers of this world more than a match for the alleged conquering power of the Gospel of the Son of God?"

Let fair recognition be given to all these great difficulties to be encountered by those who go forth to preach; let the large sacrifice which in various ways must be made by them, be considered; let the numerous discouragements sure to be met with, and the apparent defeats sometimes to be suffered, be squarely faced—not one of these, nor all of them combined, should rob us of our confident trust is the ultimate issue of the preacher's work. Instead of dampening their ardor and relaxing their efforts, the knowledge of these things should rather arouse their energies and fire the zeal of those who are engaged in this sphere of the Lord's service. The majestic plans of God—those pertaining to the spheres above and the outworking of His laws in the universe around, no more than those with which the faithful preacher identifies himself in the moral and spiritual realm—go forth silently, constantly, surely. They are never broken, never drawn back. With the advancement of the centuries, Christendom at least, if not the world, should come to see more and more clearly, that the banners of the Lord of Hosts never go down in any struggle, and that he who walks and works with God, as the Christian preacher consciously should from day to day, is sure of triumph.

This knowledge of the guiding and controlling hand of God in human history, of His attendant power and presence with His servants, and of His unfailing resources in achieving triumphant victories in every conflict, should be assiduously and prayerfully cultivated by the preacher. To do so he will find much stimulus and assistance in holding up before his mind's eye, loftiest ideals of his office and in pursuing them steadfastly hour after hour. As every one knows our ideals are the sternest critics of our accomplishments, and the preacher above all others, needs the spur of them in order to be lifted up to seize the possibilities of which he is capable, and to discharge the obligations of which he is conscious. As it exists to-day the preacher's office combines in one the three offices indicated in the New Testament as those of the evan-



gelist, the teacher and the prophet—and around the ideas suggested by these terms, several considerations on the ideals of the preacher's office may be conveniently gathered.

*First*, then the ideal of the preacher's office as an evangelist may be brought under notice. The primary and fundamentally important function of the preacher's office is indicated by this name, evangelist—a bearer of good news. The name, it is evident, involves a designation of the theme on which he is to speak, and points to the fact, freighted with gladness for a sad and sinful world, which he is to proclaim. Whatever more the glorious Gospel may be, it is first and above all, the history of something that did occur. That history has far-reaching presuppositions and implications; it has force as the spring of transformed humanity, of individual and social progress—and these open out into a wide room where all speculative and practical intellects may expatiate. The beginning of them all however, is a Person, together with the historic facts of His life, His death and His resurrection. That is the grain of mustard seed which has grown into the great tree in whose branches all the birds can nest and sing, beneath whose shadows the nations can house and worship.

"We preach Christ and Him crucified." It is one thing to preach salvation by Christ, it is another to preach Christ and Him as the Savior. The more he can free himself in proclaiming the evangel from the abstract and technical terms of the philosophy in which Christian doctrine is formulated, and instead make his words throb with the miracle of that loving human heart, with the pathos and power of that death for a world's sin, and with the glory of that triumphant resurrection from the dead, the more will the Christian preacher deserve and find cause of rejoicing in the name evangelist. "We preach Jesus and the resurrection." That is the matchless theme put upon the preacher's lips, and no human substitute can ever displace it either for sublimity of content or efficaciousness of power unto salvation. It embraces the glory and the power of God. The great weakness of modern preach-

ing, according to the discriminating judgment of John Ruskin lies in telling men too much what they ought to do, and not enough of what God has done for them. The general testimony of successful preachers is that hearts are more surely to be won by showing them Jesus crucified, yea, risen again, than by expatiating on the glories of heaven, or denouncing the sin and folly of this or that selfish indulgence.

In his profoundly earnest and devout book on "The Death of Christ" which, all of us have been lately reading and profiting by,—and declining to follow at not a few of its points,—Dr. Denney says that "true repentance,—that is repentance which is not self-centered, but which realizes that sin is something in which God has an interest as well as we; repentance which is not merely a remorseful or apathetic or despairing regret, but a hopeful, healing and sanctifying sorrow,—such repentance is born of the knowledge of God and of what God has done for us is in our sins." In commenting on the Parable of Dives and Lazarus the incisive observation is made by Marcus Dods that "only the revelation to our souls of the beauty of holiness, only the revelation of God, in the fullest sense of these words, can teach us to fix our hearts unalterably on God and all that lives with Him and in Him. Only by seeing Him and knowing Him, can we learn to love Him, and only by loving Him can we be perfected as men." In the stirring and masterly volume on "The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement" which in the last year or two has been more widely read than any other recent treatise on this profound subject, its author, the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, declares that "it is not the consciousness of sin which leads men to seek after God; it is the consciousness of God which brings home to them the presence, the power, the heinousness of sin." These prominent scholars and theologians, whose views on many doctrines are widely divergent, are at one here, and lend their strong, unequivocal, testimony in confirmation of the position above taken. What changes in method, many a preacher would make could the truth of their words be given

place in his mind! How immeasurably more fruitful many a ministry might be made by simply remembering their words and preaching in accordance with their suggestions! It is the record of history that the first Moravian missionaries to Greenland, after twenty years of fruitless toil in indirect approaches to the savage mind, found it suddenly responsive to the appeal of the Cross. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." He who spake thus was lifted up on Calvary! The end to be accomplished was reached,—for the joy of redeeming a race set before Him, "He endured the cross despising the shame and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." The foremost business of the Christian preacher as an evangelist is to make proclamation of this fact to the world.

There is a rather widely prevalent opinion, every reader of current religious thought knows, that much of present-day preaching is defective when it comes to the making of announcement of the cross, and that to this defect much of the inefficiency of modern preaching is directly to be attributed. "To preach the love of God out of relation to the death of Christ, or to preach the love of God in the death of Christ but without being able to relate it to sin, or to preach the forgiveness of sins as the free gift of God's love while the death of Christ has no special significance assigned to it, is not, if the New Testament is the rule and standard of Christianity, to preach the Gospel at all." This representative quotation from one who is of the opinion just referred to, will be generally accepted as a fair characterization of the preaching at present to be heard from many pulpits on these topics, whether or not the arraignment that it is not the Gospel at all be regarded as valid. As to the latter it is not necessary here to express judgment. What is to the point now is that many preachers in our time find themselves without a definite conception of the meaning of the Cross; they are at war with traditional ideas of the atonement, and perhaps unconsciously, their views on this great doctrine are held in abeyance and

reserve. Such ones deal in their pulpit ministrations with what Robertson Nicoll has somewhere called "the suburban interests of religion,—the outlying districts between Christianity and, say art or literature or sociology." Certainly these are touched, all of them, by Christianity which is *the* truth and related therefore to all truth. But the convincing and constraining and converting assertions of the faith are more at the center and are deserving of primary emphasis. They gather around the great truths of the Incarnation, the Atonement, sin and immorality, and whenever these are neglected, the preacher's inability to produce spiritual results will soon be demonstrated. Far better therefore that in the pursuit of the ideal of his office, he should in simplest way unfold the great spiritual statements of the Bible, and out of clear conviction assert them explicitly, unmistakably, urgently and repeatedly, than win for himself popular applause and crowded congregations by delighting them with "neat, clever, original, sermonettes on some snippet of a verse," or lecturing to them on modern poets, philosophers, statesmen, or "current topics." Doing the latter he necessarily demagnetizes the Gospel at the point where the Master supposed its attractive power to be, he shifts the centre of attraction from where it was Divinely put; his message is shorn of the power which resides in the Cross, and soon his voice fails to ring out the joyful, vibrating notes of One whose name is Jesus because He saves His people from their sins. Without the Saviour there is no Gospel to be preached.

*Second*, the ideal of the preacher's office as a teacher must be recognized. The function of teaching follows very closely, or rather comes immediately with, that of heralding the evangel. The teaching function nowadays is often depreciated and sneeringly spoken of as having been largely if not entirely superseded by the hundred-voiced Press. No one should more readily own the widely extended influence of the press, or through the employment of it more constantly seek to multiply his own usefulness, than the Christian preacher, but if its

influence supersedes that of his pulpit, let the truth be told namely, that it is his own fault. The story goes that a certain minister once told a clever old lady that he was engaged to deliver an address before the Synod on the power of the pulpit, and asked what her views on the subject were? She answered: "The power of the pulpit! That depends on who's in it!" The truth she expressed is worth laying to heart by every preacher who is intent upon maintaining high ideals for his office. If he is superseded it will be due to his own deficiencies. The living voice has all its old power of winning and instructing to-day, but it must be a voice, and not a mumble, to command attention. Where is the man that has anything to say on the great affirmations of the Gospel, for instance that God loves us, that Christ redeemed us, that death does not destroy us, and who says it with all his heart and soul and strength, that is without hearers? The printed page in paper or book has its province, and the preacher has his, and neither can efface or supply the place of the other. The cry that the pulpit is effete is often heard, but where does it come from? Mostly from those who do not despise the pulpit so much as dislike the truths and duties it insists on with power greater than is agreeable to them in their present attitude toward morals and religion.

The importance and necessity of exercising with all diligence and care the function of teaching in the ministerial office, has a profound philosophical basis. God's way of moving men is to bring truth to their understandings, which shall set their emotions to work, and so pass on to move the will, the executive in man, and thus at last affect the actions and mould the conduct of life. It is an old and thoroughly trustworthy saying that "religion begins with knowledge, proceeds to temper and ends in practice." The preacher who in the exercise of his office as evangelist, will not at the same time exercise that of teacher is building nothing that will last. And not less one-sided and therefore transient will be the work of the preacher who teaches only, and is not an

evangelist. The two functions must work side by side, mutually complementing each other, if the highest ends are to be realized. For its substance the inexhaustible resources of Christian doctrine will of course be drawn upon by the preacher in the prosecution of his educational work. This, it is often supposed, congregations do not want and will not tolerate. R. W. Dale in the preface of one of his rich books relates that when a young man beginning his ministry, a neighboring pastor came and in a friendly way remarked to him: "I hear you are preaching doctrinal sermons at Carr's Lane; they will not stand it." And he adds: "I answered, 'they will have to stand it.'" His conception of the ministry required him to give that reply, and with great fidelity and brilliant success he endeavored to remain true to that conception during a pastorate of more than forty years in the same church. What subjects for pulpit treatment and Christian edification are at all to be compared to those suggested by and kindred with the fundamental truths of the creed? Is it possible for Christian thought ever to travel beyond the Fatherhood of God, the Incarnation, the Sacrifice, the Ascension and Enthronement of His Son, the outpouring and the indwelling of His spirit, the forgiveness of sins and the life everlasting? Whatever progress we may be able to make, these great truths can never be left behind. Loyal teachers, however progressive, will wish to conserve them in their instructions, and "whosoever goeth onward" or "taketh the lead," as the marginal reading has it, and "abideth not in the teaching of Christ," St. John, it will be remembered, reminds us for our warning, "hath not God."

What a practically boundless scope is offered the preacher by these conceptions of instruction from the Gospel! To lead minds to see the deep and far-reaching truths that underlie the evangel, what its facts presuppose of God and man, of the Father and the Eternal Word, what they reveal of the heart of things and of the Heart to which they are related; to lead minds to the recognition and still more to the

application to individual and social and civil life, of the principles that flow from the facts; to disclose to the minds and lay to the hearts of men the Incarnation, the Sacrifice and the Reign of Jesus as the world-redeeming power, as the revelation of the perfect life for men and nations; to find and exhibit in Jesus the answer to all the questions of the intellect, the satisfaction of all the needs of the heart, the source and standard of ethics, the fountain of all wisdom, the renovator of humanity, the purifier of society, the king of men,—these indicate the scope and mark the task put before the Christian preacher by a true ideal of his office as teacher. Is it possible that he should ever want for a subject to preach upon? Will he ever discover talents, capacities, endowments or attainments which may not well be summoned into his service while discharging his duties under this aspect of them? All the resources of human knowledge may be placed under tribute by him. For the best and broadest culture he will find ample room. His theme may be elaborated with the closest thought and adorned with all the graces of literary and artistic finish,—it will not be too good for the subject he is dealing with nor too valuable to be used in the service which preaching and teaching are designed to render. The wider the imaginative and artistic intellect sweeps its circle, however, the stronger must it be at its center; the more it lengthens its cords, the more must it strengthen its stakes,—and the middle prop that holds up the tent must be the Christ of God. “Him first, Him last, Him midst and without end,”—that is the preacher’s motto. All that he teaches in the pulpit is summed up in one word,—Christ.

By implication this summing up of all in Christ means that the great text-book to be used by the Christian preacher in his work of instruction is the written word of the Old and New Testaments. Greatly to his relief the historical and critical work done during the last generation in the way of reëxamining those Scriptures, has resulted in reëstablishing a once shaken confidence and distressed faith in their authenticity and



integrity, in unveiling their deeper spiritual content, and thus in enriching their value for educational, homiletical purposes. For the Christian preacher therefore the study of no other book can take the place of that of the Bible. No discipline is at once so important and rewarding for both teacher and taught as the minute and painstaking study of its sacred pages. He who keeps himself constantly steeped in the Holy Scriptures, even at the expense if need be of knowing the latest phase of current religious discussion or the most recent piece of popular fiction, will have a clearness of spiritual outlook that will illuminate many dark things, and a firmness of touch that will beget confidence in and support from his hearers. He will have the secret of perpetual freshness, and the dread of approaching the "dead-line" of usefulness will never be known by him. "Holding forth the word of life" faithfully and intelligently, he will shine as a "light of the world." But not for himself only, for others also such devotion to the sacred Scriptures is essential. They and they alone are adapted to meet the deepest needs of the human heart, needs which in the last issue are identical in all men. The sad and the sorrowing are to be comforted, torpid souls are to be stung or startled or wooed into sensitiveness and activity, eyes glued to the earth are to be drawn to the upward look, the inmost self which is ever in the depths, lonely, is to be led to the "Immortal Companion," the lover of all souls, the consciousness of the burden and bondage of sin is to be roused, and when roused soothed and comforted—and the preacher-teacher is to do all this! "Who is sufficient for these things?" Surely the vision of the needs of an assembled congregation might strike the most eloquent dumb, and make the most self-confident timid were it not for the reminder that there is a "sufficiency from God." That sufficiency will attend the Christian preacher in the measure that he holds to the ideal of his office as teacher by faithfully and steadfastly following out the purpose of making his preaching the inspired word to the Father's children.

*Third*, the ideal of the preacher's office as a prophet remains to claim our attention. Besides the evangelistic and the educational functions of the ministerial office there is one more which on account of its ethical import may properly be designated as prophetic. Readers of the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW have long ago been made acquainted with the fact that in the office of the prophet of Scripture, the predictive is not the sole, not even the principal element; but that his chief function is to hold aloft the Divine Ideal to his contemporaries; to bring life, —individual, social, commercial and civil,—to the test of the requirements of a holy and righteous God; to stand with that requirement before King and people unawed and undismayed; and to command compliance with the same in the name of the Lord, and in the Lord's name to denounce its transgressions no matter who the guilty one may be, or on whom the condemnation falls.

A similar function, an identical prophetic element, belongs to the preacher of the Gospel at the beginning of this new century, and for the discharge of it, he, no less than the Hebrew one of old, must have "inspiration" from on high. Without that he will lack the primarily necessary qualification successfully to perform this supremely difficult task. According to the late A. B. Davidson in his posthumous book on "The Called of God," which is eminently worthy of being read by every preacher, the great purpose for which a minister is settled in a charge is not to study or visit or preach but to be "a personal, living demonstration that the things spoken of in the Church are realities, that however hard the ideal may be to realize, the prophet of our time, and those whom he addresses, should feel that the words he speaks are put by God into his mouth, and that in order to a fruitful ministry such an immediateness of God with the preacher is a fundamental necessity." Do we not, in the prayers we offer and in the hymns we sing, constantly acknowledge our need of and yearning for such "inspiration"? When in our public utterances we give expression to what we have heard quietly whispered

in the ear in many a secret "hour of high communion with the living God," and say "Thus saith the Lord"; when by long seasons of personal, prayerful fellowship with God, by earnest effort to stretch the narrow tablet of our finite mind so as to make it capacious enough to hold somewhat of the amplitude of the Infinite's message; when by sedulous suppressions of our own clamorous opinions and resolute rejection of the world's noisy allurements; when by docile, childlike trust we avail ourselves of the wisdom that is from above for the guidance of ourselves and others,—are we less really inspired than was the ancient seer, for instance, whose lips were touched with a live coal? Who can think so? Who ever could have thought so, had not false views as to what inspiration implies, and unwarranted notions as to what reverence is due to ancient writings, left their disastrous effects on large sections of the modern mind?

Is it not just such inspiration, as is here insisted on, such a consciousness of Divine power, guidance and illumination resting upon him, that the present day preacher-prophet must have to make him the brave, the courageous, the victorious man that God needs in the Christian pulpit to-day? His mission as a prophet of the Most High God is to hold forth the Divine Ideal to our age, and no one will dispute the age's need of seeing and aspiring more strenuously for its attainment. He is set in his exalted place to insist with all the authority to which his own life shows he himself bows, that the principles of the Gospel must be brought to bear on human life in all its aspects. He is to pronounce benedictions on all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. He is to direct the search-light of the Divine Holiness on individual sins, especially those prevalent in the class or classes from which his hearers are drawn. He is to apply the measure of the sanctuary to worldly maxims taken to be axioms, and to selfish practices thought to be legitimate because customary and popular. He must witness without fear against the cancerous vices which are eating out the very life of individuals and

families, of cities and nations. He must bring national policies and acts to the standard of the teaching of Jesus, and affirm with unmistakable distinctness that true and righteous politics is but Christian principles applied to municipal, state or national life. He must proclaim the great doctrine of the Fatherhood of God with all that it signifies and implies for man's relationship to man, and bring all the social, industrial and commercial ills which are now perplexing and distracting such large portions of the family of our Father who is in Heaven and setting them into hatred of and antagonism with each other, under its benign, reconciling and saving power. He must do all this and much more in pressing home to men's consciences these ethical aspects of the Gospel which he preaches. And the more closely he can hold to this ideal of his office in fulfilling the prophetic function of his calling, and doing so in entire unity with the evangelistic and educational functions already considered, the richer and more satisfying, no doubt, will be the results achieved by his ministry.

Living as the Christian preacher of to-day does, in a time when the Gospel of the divine glory has shot its radiance everywhere upon the world's history, when the spiritual skies are all aglow with the splendors of the Life and Death, the Resurrection and Ascension of the Son of God, and when the Pentecostal illumination and quickening have opened celestial principalities to his vision and experience,—who is there that should not have his heart and harp made jubilant with praise when a call to this high office is addressed to himself, his child or his friend? Who is there that after accepting the call should not summon all the strength afforded him by the Spirit, in holding unwaveringly and unweariedly to the loftiest ideals known to his office? Its responsibilities no doubt are great, but immeasurably greater are its privileges and its joys. When at college fitting for the law the late Hugh Price Hughes whose brilliant and magnetic power as a public speaker was fully matched by his humble, self-denying devotion to Christ and His Church, became persuaded one day of his duty to give up

the law for the Gospel. He at once wrote home: "Dear Father,—I have decided to become a preacher. Your affectionate son, Hugh." The returning post brought him this equally laconic reply: "Dear Hugh,—I should sooner see you a preacher than Premier of all England. Your devoted,—Father." Every one duly appreciative of the honor and dignity, the satisfactions and possibilities of the ministerial office must recognize in this parental approval of a son's noble decision, only that which was properly its due. Every Christian preacher called of God to his office, even when obliged to labor in humblest and obscurest fields, would not, could not, think of exchanging his place for the most exalted post in civil or professional life. For him the honors and emoluments of public office, building and bargaining, mining and merchandising, money-making and pleasure-seeking, have but insignificant attractiveness as compared with that of the Gospel ministry to which God has called, and he consecrated himself.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

## V.

### SOUND EXEGESIS THE BASIS OF EFFECTIVE PREACHING.

BY REV. PH. VOLLMER, PH.D., D.D.

Exegesis is the art of ascertaining and unfolding the true meaning of the inspired writers, according to established hermeneutical principles, without adding to it, subtracting from it or changing it in any way; in other words, without forcing upon the authors a meaning in harmony with preconceived opinions. This exegetical process deserves to be called sound when it furnishes a clear answer to the three simple questions, namely, (1) What does the text *say*; (2) what does it *mean*; (3) what does it *teach*; in other words, when a given text is correctly explained, interpreted and applied.

Take a concrete case and imagine a preacher with a selected text before him. The first question he should ask is, what does this text *say*. To ascertain this he must proceed as in the case of other writings, seeking by the aid of grammar, lexicons and commentaries to explain its terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, sections and chapters. This is called grammatical exegesis, the first stage of which is the etymological examination of the principal words. Great aid may be derived from a sober and skilful tracing of words back to their roots. Luther says somewhere that he had long been in doubt as to a real meaning of that fundamental New Text term, repentance (*μετάνοια*), Roman Catholic exegesis having succeeded in completely obscuring it even in the minds of theologians. Melancthon one day explained to him that the preposition *μετά* in compound words often expressed the idea of transposition. This at once opened Luther's eyes as to the primary meaning of the term and from that time on he invariably de-

fined it as expressing a complete change of mind followed by a corresponding change in conduct. These word studies are especially important in the case of synonyms. For example, in James I: 17, there are two terms for the same general conception. One is *δῶαι*, gift, which expresses the idea in general; the second is *δώρημα*, which implies the idea of fullness and liberality. The Revised Version, therefore, correctly translates, "Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above." Or take the familiar phrase "in Christ," and "in God." A careful distinction will show that it may express a fourfold union. God is in us as He was in Christ, by a personal union, or as He was in the prophets, by a special illumination and power, or as He is in the children of God, by a renewal of their whole man, or as He is in all men, by His general providence.

But etymology is slippery ground because words continually change their meaning. For this reason Biblical terms must also be studied historically. In the New Testament this is the more important because Christianity has greatly changed the Greek by removing it from its sphere and obliging it to give expression to a life to which it was originally foreign. The world of new thought which Christianity called into being formed new terms to express them, or emptied old terms of their former meaning, filling them with a new one. In proportion as men were converted, they converted the language. Plato certainly could not have understood the Greek of the New Testament except by becoming a Christian. For this reason, all the dictionaries of the world, based on classical Greek alone, would never help the student to interpret the New Testament. For example, the term *Logos* means in Plato word or reason; in Philo, the eternal reason, Jehovah; But in St. John, the Son of God, and in Hebrew IV: 12, the Word of God. Moreover, the peculiarities of the New Testament writers themselves must also be considered. For inspiration expresses simply the idea of Divine assistance and guidance, and does not mean the destruction of the personality



of the sacred writer. The word *faith*, *e. g.*, is used by Paul to express his idea of a mystical union with Christ, while James understands by the same term mere orthodox belief. From these considerations it follows that there are few things which we should have more at heart than to awaken in us an enthusiasm for the grammar and the lexicon. When rightly used we shall gain better results from them than from many volumes of dogmatics. They will prove instruments of training the mind into close and accurate habits of thought and will increase our intellectual wealth. By it we become aware of delicate variations in an author's meaning. We can not make any secure advance in sound exegesis without a patient investigation of the forces of words and their precise value. Disappointment awaits him who thinks to possess the whole without first possessing the parts of which that whole is composed. Translations of the Bible are insufficient for this purpose, because, first, no translation can give all shades of meaning contained in the original; secondly, the best translation can not be thoroughly understood after the generation in which it was made without resort to the original, and thirdly, even the best translations which the people have, do not allow the holy writers to speak in modern English or German to the people. The recently revised translations in both languages teem with obsolete idioms. When, therefore, the question is asked, sometimes even by educated ministers, what advantage will an imperfect knowledge of the original languages give us, since we really cannot master them, I answer, in Paul's phraseology, much every way; first of all, it will enable us to understand the best commentaries which are all based on the original text. We may not be able to write English like Shakespeare, or German like Schiller, but we can understand them and admire the thoughts which they so beautifully express and which lose much of their power even in the best translations. Dr. Briggs, therefore, is right when he says: "Only the philologist can be an interpreter. Others than philologists may become interpreters of the Scripture by depending upon the labors of

the philologist in the translations and expositions which they produce."

The second question which sound exegesis asks is, What does the text *mean*? That is, it endeavors to find what was in the mind of the sacred author when he penned these words. This process is called interpretation or historical exegesis. As the whole external and internal life of a people, its social and political conditions are reflected in its literature, it follows that sound interpretation is impossible without at least a general knowledge of history, archæology, geography, chronology, etc. And here it is where traditional exegesis has made her greatest mistakes, and where modern progressively orthodox exegesis has reaped its finest harvest. Dr. Henry S. Nash says: "The old exegesis took the Bible out of its historical setting, and removed it from its relations to definite times and concrete situations, causing the men of the Bible to speak altogether in the language of the men of a far later time. The aim of our (the modern orthodox) exegesis is to find the Bible at home within its history, and having found it there to listen patiently and reverently while it tells its story in its own tongue." Closely connected with this process is the so-called psychological method, that is the endeavor to ascertain not only what the author said, but why, under the influence of any given circumstances, he said it just so. Horne says: "The scope is the soul of the book, and that being once ascertained, every argument and every word appears in its right place and is perfectly intelligible. But if the scope be not duly considered, everything becomes obscure, however clear and obvious its meaning may really be." Luther would not have called the epistle of James an epistle of straw if he had understood that its design is not to combat justification by a living faith, but to combat reliance upon dead orthodoxy for salvation. Sometimes the book itself states the scope, but generally we have to find it out by a careful study of the context. Therefore, to interpret without regard to the context, is to interpret at random; but to interpret contrary to the context is to

teach error. For example, in 1 Cor. VII: 1, Paul says: "It is not good for man to marry." A little startled by this remarkable statement, we read on to verse 26th, in which he says: "It is not good for the present distress." Taking the text and context together, the true interpretation appears, which is, that marriage is an excellent thing, but may be very inexpedient in times of severe persecution.

But interpretation is not preaching. The teacher in the class room may stop when he has ascertained what a given text says and what it means, but the preacher must go one step further and ask the third question, what does this text *teach*, that is, what is the underlying permanent principle applicable to the faith and practice of God's people of all times and climes. In other words, he tries to make the Biblical author talk English and German to his congregation, assembled in Philadelphia and not in Palestine, composed of people living in the twentieth century and not in the first century, surrounded by social, political and commercial conditions entirely different from those in the Roman Empire. This is called application, or doctrinal and practical exegesis.

As an illustration of the whole exegetical process as heretofore explained, take, *e. g.*, the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard. What it *says*, the words, clauses and allusions, are easily explained. More important is it to find out what the parable means, *i. e.*, to ascertain what was in the Lord's mind when He uttered it on the Tuesday of the Passion Week. But the most important question is: What does the parable *teach*? A careful consideration will make it plain to the preacher that the lesson contained in it for His people as well as for all times, is that of stewardship and rigid accountability according to each individual's endowments and ability. Or take James V: 14: "Is any among you sick, let him call for the elders, etc." What the passage says is easily understood. What James means, is, that in the absence of the medical profession in those times, the elders should care for the bodies as well as for the souls of the members. What it teaches in

our own times is that if a church member is sick he should call for the minister for spiritual consolation because sickness depresses the spirit, and he should also call in a reputable physician and give all faith-curists, Dowieists, quacks and Christian Scientists a wide berth.

Of course, these three steps need not to be followed independently, one by one. They will often intermingle. While engaged in word studies, practical applications will come to the preacher's mind, and vice versa. But all the three steps should be regarded as the component parts of a thorough exegetical process.

But a man may be an interpreter according to the most approved grammatical-historical method and yet he may not do justice to the Scripture. Therefore, besides these varied intellectual acquirements, sound exegesis calls for two moral qualifications, the first of which is a *supreme regard for the truth*. God will not hold guiltless any one who tampers with the truth in the interest of preconceived opinions. This demand can, of course, be only very relatively realized. Strictly speaking, no sphere of knowledge is without its presuppositions. Even the physical scientist postulates a number of self-evident axioms. The personal equation plays a most important part in everything that man does. No man's mind is *tabula rasa*, least of all that of the preacher. He can not entirely divest himself from his nationality, early training, theological education, mental habits and moral character, and approach the Bible as a new-born babe. Hence we observe that the majority of the exegetes study the Bible with the expressed or implied aim of finding in it either a confirmation of the statements of their adopted creed or of the principles of their philosophical system. The ideal interpreter, however, is the man who earnestly endeavors to empty his mind of everything which is merely of a theological or philosophical nature, and to approach the Bible simply as a living member of that same mystical body of Christ, the founders of which partly accepted and partly wrote themselves the history of

God's revelation to men contained in the sacred volume. We are well aware that some critics would denounce even experimental religion and warm love for the Bible as a mental condition unfavorable to the clear apprehension of the meaning of its contents. If this state of mind disqualifies a man for scientific Bible study, then, of course, we had better sit at the feet of those cold-blooded literateurs whose minds are saturated with presumptions of just the opposite character, and who care as little, and sometimes less, what becomes of the Bible at their hands, as philologists care what effect their criticism may have upon the people's opinion concerning Homer, Niebelungen, or Shakespeare. This, of course, would be acting on the presumption that an indifferent lawyer, or a personal enemy was better qualified to apprehend the real spirit of a father's letter, than that father's son. But who will concede that or trust to "unprejudiced" results of such a character? If, therefore, the demand that the search after the truth should be pursued without preconceived opinions is to have a meaning, it is this—but this it must mean—that the Bible should be approached with candor, fairness and love for the truth; without stupid dogmatism and narrow-minded bigotry; with a mind free from self-inflated rationalism and fanatical naturalism. In other words, the preacher should cultivate a disposition such as Cowper describes in his familiar lines:

A critic on the sacred book should be,  
Candid and learn'd, dispassionate and free,  
Free from the wayward bias bigots feel,  
From fancy's influence and intemperate zeal.  
For of all arts sagacious dupes invent,  
To cheat themselves and gain the world's assent,  
The worst is—Scriptures warped from its intent.

Closely connected with this is a second moral qualification of the successful exegete, namely, sympathy with the divine truth, congeniality of the inner man with the objective truth as it is in Jesus. By this I do not mean to give expression to

that commonplace thought that in order to be a good preacher one must be a pious man, for this goes without saying. What I wish to emphasize is the well-established scientific principle that cordial sympathy and love for the Bible is essential to an adequate understanding of its contents. The explanation of this scientific law is simple enough. The student penetrates into the contents of the Bible most profoundly and conveys the impressions and ideas received most vividly when he is dealing with things that have entered most intimately into his own life. These will leave the most clearly defined impressions upon his own mind. A genuine sympathy between his spirit and the spirit of Christ will enable him to interpret the deepest ideas of the Scriptural truth by a sort of divine intuition. This principle is not peculiar to Bible study. It is readily recognized in all other spheres of life. Music, art and literature will only disclose their beauty and secrets to those who have a heart to love them. Beethoven, Raphael, Shakespeare and Goethe may receive conventional praises from prosaic natures, but they will never be truly appreciated by them. "Willst du den Dichter recht verstehn, musst du in Dichter's Lande gehn," says Goethe. This principle of sacred hermeneutics is emphasized in the simple language of the Bible itself. The clearest enunciation of it is found in 1 Cor. 2, 6-16: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." It is, therefore, not remarkable that unspiritual men can not penetrate into the deep things of God's revelation; on the contrary, it would be the most remarkable phenomenon if men without the life of God pulsating in their heart could be for us trustworthy guides in interpretation. Prayer and the love of God are just as important to the successful exegete, as grammar and lexicon. "For, when the heart is dead, the eye can not see," said Carlyle. And the opening of the eyes comes not from acuteness of intellect and capability of scientific investigation, but from purity of heart, from innocence of life, from a reverent, loving and obedient disposition toward God. "Blessed are

the pure in heart, for they shall see God." "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." To know the truth is something more and vastly greater than to know things about the Bible which contains the truth. For these reasons the greatest preachers of the world have been men who combined in their personality genuine piety and profound learning. "God must be loved in order to be known," says Augustine. In the same spirit Dr. Briggs writes: "The Scriptures can not be understood from the outside by grammar, logic, rhetoric and history alone. The Bible is to be understood from its center, its heart, its Christ." And to the same effect Bishop Maggee writes in "The Gospel and the Age": "There is no demonstration of the Gospel possible for the natural man. We can demonstrate it for you neither by the authority of an infallible church nor by the reasoning of an infallible philosophy. Wisdom is justified of her children. And of them alone. Believe it and you will know its truth. Try the remedies we offer you and you shall experience their efficacy. The Gospel of Christ crucified must always stand in irreconcilable antagonism alike to those who would harden it into a superstition and to those who would dissolve it into a philosophy. The same idea is eloquently discussed in the justly famous sermon by F. W. Robertson, on the topic, "Obedience, the organ of spiritual knowledge."

Having outlined the process of what we understand by sound exegesis, the question arises, how and in what way will sound exegesis make our preaching effective in the best sense of the word? I will confine my answer to four points. First, by deriving most of our material directly from the fountain of living water, our sermons will show a degree of *freshness* not otherwise attainable. There is a difference between a drink from the mountain springs directly and one from the spigot in our house after the water has passed through the Schuylkill, the reservoirs and the water pipes, carrying along quantities of mud and dangerous microbes. There is also a



difference between the taste of an apple plucked directly from the tree and one preserved in a jar or dried by the process of evaporation. There is a difference between the beauty of flowers in the garden and those preserved for the use of lectures on botany. I am very far from undervaluing the systematizing of the teaching of the Word of God in catechisms, or dogmatical and ethical treatises. The educated mind naturally craves for it, and will not be satisfied with anything less. A preacher who wants to teach with any degree of self-consistency must have some theological system. To merely know the facts is to be no higher than an animal. An educated man must know the relation of facts to each other and to mankind. But what I insist upon is that getting the truth principally through catechisms and the dogmatics is getting it at second-hand, at a discount, in an artificial, abstract form, by which it inevitably loses much of the power and beauty, the plainness and perspicuity of its natural setting. Encyclopedias of quotations from Shakespeare, alphabetically arranged, are certainly useful books. One can see at a glance what the poet has ever written on subjects like "God," faith, conscience, liberty, etc. But if any one supposes that he will, through such books, receive an adequate idea of the grace, beauty and power of the works of the myriad-minded poet, he is sadly mistaken. In order to get that he must study Shakespeare's plays in their natural form, as penned by him. Just so with the Bible. "God is a spirit," is a grand dictum even in its disconnected form, quoted as a proof text in the catechism; but how much more powerful and fresh does it appear when read in its living, natural, organic connection in the story of the Samaritan woman! When, therefore, on the Lord's Day, the preacher succeeds in plucking such a sweet fruit, full of its natural juice directly from the tree of life, and without first pressing the juice out of it, presents it to his people in all its freshness, they will gladly accept of it, and, figuratively speaking, take a big bite of it, and while the sweet juice is running down their cheeks, they will go home, feel-

ing, thinking, and sometimes saying, "Indeed the statutes of the Lord are sweeter than honey and the honeycomb" (Ps. 19, 11). The charge of dullness in the pulpit has become proverbial, and only the immediate approach to the Bible will successfully do away with it. The old German mythology speaks of a river called Ygdrasil. Old men who bathed therein became young again. Sound exegesis is that river for the preacher. It will give us freshness unpolluted by the muddy river of cheap sensationalism. Contact with those masterpieces of Biblical literature will brace up the preacher's own intellect.

Sound exegesis, in the second place, will make our sermons effective, because it will strengthen the preacher's faith in the essentials of God's revelation, and will thereby enable him to exert a convincing influence upon his people also. Reverent biblical criticism is a sacred obligation. It can never hurt, for living faith rests on foundations which lie far beyond the reach of any critical conclusions. True as we know all this to be, yet experience has taught many a preacher that even reverent criticism often has a tendency to impair the robustness of our spiritual life, for the simple reason that the critical atmosphere is in itself chilly, often malarial and not altogether healthy. Professional critics of secular literature even have been heard to complain that they had almost lost the faculty of really *enjoying* a piece of literature. In the case of a preacher, a similar experience would seal his fate as an effective preacher, for, as Theremin truly says, "In proportion as the sacred orator loses the conviction of the Divine authority of the Bible, his eloquence must also lose its power." And Longfellow adds, "The sermon is no sermon to me, in which I cannot hear the heart beat." Now, sound exegesis, as we understand its process and its spirit, will strengthen the preacher's conviction in the word of God, on the principle of Bacon's dictum that a mere nipping at the Word of God increases doubt, while deep and constant draughts removes them. And as convictions are contagious,

a Bible student will also impress and convince his people, in other words, his preaching will prove to be effective.

Sound exegesis will, in the third place, make our preaching effective, because it will make our sermons instructive. Didactic preaching of the right kind is very popular. Men thirst for information. The preacher makes a mistake who thinks that only men with college education can think. And yet, Spurgeon's criticism, I think, is only too true, that "many sermons are deficient in solid instruction, biblical exposition and sound argument; they are flashy rather than fleshy; clever rather than solid; entertaining rather than impressive, reflective discourse in which doctrine is barely discernible, brilliant harangues from which no food for the soul could ever be extracted." There are preachers who, *e. g.*, during the whole season of Lent, entertain their people with sentimental gush, criticisms of the disciples, railing against Judas, praising the women at the cross; but for a well-reasoned-out sermon on the relations of Christ's sufferings and death to our salvation they find no time. Only thorough Bible study will supply this deficiency. It will enable the preacher to dissipate ignorance, awaken thought, sow the seeds of truth in the minds of men and make them children of light who grow in knowledge. A preacher who excels in the faculty of lucid, logical and forceful statement will be listened to with profit, for we all know that it is a great gift to make the profound truths of the Bible clear to all classes of our people. They have a right to the very best we can give them. The principal truths of the Bible, as Parker says, answer more questions, satisfy more aspirations, respond to more necessities, and supply better motives for service than any other system that invites the confidence of men.

Sound exegesis will, in the fourth place, make our preaching effective because it will saturate us with the beautiful language, the forcible style, the clear and simple logic and the picturesque, plastic and concrete diction of the Bible. It will wean us from preaching in theological terms and Latinized

language, as well as from the abstract presentations of the Christian truths.

I presume very few will dissent from what has been said concerning the way to become effective preachers. But in order really to profit from a discussion like this the following or similar rules should be observed. (1) Make it a rule, allowing few exceptions, to read at some part of every day two chapters in the Old and one in the New Testament during your whole life, beginning in Genesis and Matthew; (2) at convenient periods, about once every month, read a brief book, or a section of a larger book through at one sitting, as you would read a play or a sermon, in order to get a total impression of its contents; (3) study every week one chapter exegetically according to the method indicated in this paper; (4) make yourself thoroughly familiar with every detail of the life of Christ by studying a harmony of the four Gospels, and when preaching from a text in the Gospels always consult this harmony in order to become familiar with all surrounding incidents. I would also recommend a careful perusal of the Apocryphical books of the Old and New Testaments, of the works of Josephus, of books on travel in the Holy Land, of historical novels, like "Ben Hur," "Quo Vadis," and Ebert's novels on Egypt, of Rawlinson's "Egypt and Babylon," and Brown's "Assyriology, its Use and Abuse." These and similar books are pleasant, and some of them light reading. They are at the same time very instructive, throwing strong flashlights on the correct interpretation of the Bible. Some ministers plead lack of time for such thorough Bible study. But must not a man find time for the essentials of his calling? Moreover, what is in most cases wanting is not so much time, as self-discipline and the cultivation of habits of order. Others attempt to clothe their laziness in a pious-looking garb by pretending to rely on the promise that the Holy Spirit would teach them. But is it not presumptuous to suppose that the Holy Spirit will reveal the sacred mysteries of salvation to the indolent? I would say, from

my limited experience, for the encouragement of all of us, that the gift of preaching is susceptible of great improvement. But the development of that gift depends, to a great extent, on our heeding of St. Paul's advice to Timothy: "Give thyself to reading, neglect not the gift that is in thee; meditate on these things" (1 Tim. 4, 5).

Coupled with every vocation is some indispensable *special* fitness. A lawyer is helped in his profession by many accomplishments, such as a good general education, insight into human nature and a cheerful disposition; but woe unto him if he is deficient in the knowledge of the law of the land! So a preacher derives help in his work from a great many sources, from a good general education, wide reading, command of language, the gift of imagination, a good voice, a commanding presence, a retentive memory; but he will signally fail as a really effective preacher if he neglects thorough, sound, continued Bible study. In the life of a minister, some things are unnecessary; many things are desirable, but one thing is needful, and that is the searching of the Scriptures.

## VI.

### THE END OF THE MATERIAL UNIVERSE.

BY PROF. JACOB COOPER, D.C.L., LL.D.

The order of nature shows itself under the forms of birth, growth to maturity, decay and dissolution. While each of these processes is dependent upon that which precedes, and in turn prepares the way for that which follows, they severally have their distinct periods and particularly a beginning and an end. Some pass through all these modifications quickly; others require long periods for their completion, and others again an extent of time inconceivably great. But the force which is operative in the last case, provided it be unvarying, will effect its purpose as surely as in that which passes through all its phases in a moment. For time effects nothing. It is simply the vacuum in which the forces of nature have opportunity for free play; and therefore the powers themselves and not the time of their action demand consideration.

The material universe has had a beginning at least as regards the form in which it meets our inspection. It is now passing through the processes of growth in many of its parts, and therefore in these is young. But in other portions it is mature, or even decaying. It evidently exhibits all the phases of life and death which we can understand. The end must come as a necessary sequence of the disintegrative processes which are prevalent everywhere unless they are counteracted by a greater conservative and integrating energy. Hence no matter in what stage a special part under consideration may be found, the process is hastening on to completion, to be followed by the next until it shall have passed through its several avatars and reached its final goal.

Analogy here, as everywhere else, is the only clue by which we can pass securely through the labyrinth of nature and come to the light of truth. This is a safe guide, provided we have a large number of elements for comparison, and have enough intellectual grasp to articulate them into a living system. Much has been done in this way to lay bare the foundations of world building. Geology and physical astronomy have claimed the power to trace back the material universe to its cradle, and have even arrogated to themselves the maieutic skill to deliver phenomenal worlds from the womb of chaos. It is probable that here, as in all medical practice, quackery is in direct proportion to the boast of knowledge. But if nature be a macrocosm every portion thereof is a miniature of the whole. While we can know some facts in that part which comes under our inspection these undoubtedly have a wider application, and can give true knowledge to one who has the instinct to interpret the hieroglyphics written upon every page of nature's history.

Material and force are unquestionably counterparts of each other, and either one may be enunciated in standards which express its correlation. Force as the expression of the amount of material is always reducible to motion; and this in turn is disclosed to us under the form of heat. The peculiar phase under which this discloses itself to us is expansion. The more heat there is in any material thing the farther apart will be its constituent particles. There is no limit to the effect of this process, as a general principle, in either direction. For as the tendency is constant as far as we have been able to trace it, it would be irrational to conclude that where our experiments stop for lack of accuracy in our instruments or subtlety in our power of observation the processes of nature cease. The reach of nature's possibilities seem to be unlimited in any direction to which we may turn our thought.

In the origin of the material universe the action of heat was most potent in its influence upon the substance of which this is composed. By retrogression in the history of the



earth and of her nearest neighbor and attendant, the moon, we find a constant increase of the heat. The evidences of this fact are so patent that it is admitted without question in science. There is an apparent objection in what is called the Ice Age. Then the surface of the earth from the poles to an irregular line midway toward the equator was covered with ice, and remained in this condition for ages. The reason for this is not yet well understood; and possibly man's knowledge can never penetrate those far off ages and discover the causes which effected this apparent anomaly. It may have arisen from one of the earth's numerous motions not yet understood which causes it for a period to remove at a greater than the normal distance from the sun. Nothing but such removal, or the turning of one pole from the sun by another of the numerous motions by which the temperature of the earth is affected, could have caused the suspension of the normal process of the earth's regular refrigeration by which a change extraordinary in degree and duration was effected. But this abnormal cold at the surface of the earth during the Ice Age would have only a slight effect on the external crust and would not be felt within to the distance of a thousandth part of the diameter.

The gradual increase, then, of temperature as we approach toward the center, which change is constant so far as the crust has been penetrated, the presence of comparatively few volcanoes at this day which may be considered as vent holes for the heat to escape, and the innumerable craters of such as are extinct, make it certain that the earth at some period in the past was a molten mass, which by cooling formed a crust suitable for vegetable and animal life. Then by further regression, which all systems of geology assume without hesitation we come to a period when it was not merely molten matter but further sublimated, even gaseous. The heat was so great that the particles of which the now solid globe is constituted were expanded by an energy which could volatilize

the most refractory substances. We are again brought face to face with the question: Did the process of increasing intensity of heat and consequent separation and minimizing of the particles of matter, cease at the point where our science or even imagination is unable to take cognizance? Or did it continue till matter ceased to be material and was, while the same substance, properly expressed in terms of force, energy or spirit? For undoubtedly the material and the energy which this represents are equivalent; and every process of growth or mechanical action by which force passes over into completed product is such a change. It is a transference from the immaterial, from what is apprehended by the intellect, to the material which can be grasped by the senses. This process is going on around us all the time in every domain of nature, in every mode of human activity. For the industry or creative powers of man, no difference in what way exerted, involve precisely this transference. There is the secret power, the creative energy which man employs as the minister of nature by bringing himself, through the comprehension of her laws and by employing their action, to the mastery of her energies. In this way there is something produced different from what existed before. The spiritual power of man has changed itself into material whenever a new application was added to the productive powers of nature, and produced more than she would have done if left unaided. It is ever the same, *Natura naturans*, either alone or directed by man's intelligence, by which we get the product completed and with the added increase. Nature which is only the personification of what is far better expressed by a veritable transcendent personality, God, is ever producing new organisms by which there is the transference of enough energy derived from some source to produce the newly created object. There is no more contained in the product than are in the power which produced it. There is merely a change of equivalents. So when we transport ourselves in imagination back to the

primeval era, when the substance, of which the world to be is to be constructed, existed in its subtlest, its most attenuated form (and by the analogy which we are justified from subsequent conditions in applying), in the greatest intensity of heat which it could endure—passed the dividing line between matter and spirit; then we have the beginning of the creative process. How this was done is beyond our power to discover, and doubtless if we were informed in the terms of absolute science, which means absolute truth, we with our sharpest comprehension would be unable to grasp the process. This is in no respect singular. It is our daily experience so well expressed by that master in human thought and language.\* We can do no more than bring two things together to produce a third, and nature's mysterious process does the real work. Intelligence, either immanent or transcendent—and this factor is required just as much in one mode as the other—acted upon the forces under its control, and caused them to change according to its purpose, and the result of the determination was the beginning of a phenomenal universe. This, by the process of growth according to laws enacted by that same intelligence, developed into all the fair creation, spread out like a scroll written on both sides to be read by the subordinate intelligences which are a part of the system of creation. From this point, or rather, line of transition, where the material universe began, it is developed by integration of particles of matter which have been endowed with affinity through the mysterious process of life. First material organisms were effected, in which there was a high degree of heat in their life processes to enable them to endure their environment. But the intelligence displayed in these lower forms was small. Their structures were simple, scarcely requiring separate existence. Such were the forms of crystallization in which the repulsive powers of heat were so far overcome that the

\* Bacon, Nov. Org., I., IV., *Ad opera nil aliud potest homo, quam ut corpora naturalia admoveat et amoveat: reliqua natura intus transegit.*

particles could become fixed in regular structures. For while the heat was so great that the particles were not permitted to coalesce, they would be in continued motion because their repulsion would not be overcome. By a slow process—for all the movements of nature, especially in getting ready for supreme efforts, are deliberate—the crust of the earth would be formed around the molten mass. The materials of this crust if endowed with life possessed it in its lowest forms. These would be fixed locally and be without organs fitted for independent action. But when the earth had sufficiently cooled and materials were prepared for organisms to be integrated by the mysterious principle of a separate life, the repulsive force of heat would be overcome for the development of individuals which could control their own movements. They could master the force of gravity which tended to hold them in one place, and utilize the motion caused by heat so as to produce independent action. Then would begin the world of life and separate activity among sentient beings, which would develop in efficiency until the earth was prepared for man. He as the embodiment of all the forms of intelligence and energy beneath him, and as a connecting link between them and the Supreme Divinity above them, could control the energies of nature and make them subservient to his purposes. For all the powers stored up by nature in the mineral and vegetable kingdoms are brought under the control of man. The coal and oil which represent the silent labors of the world for aeons of years are utilized continually by the minister of nature. But the more this minister utilizes her forces, whether in the materials which he employs in his increasing activities, or by the expenditure of his own energies, the more rapidly is the heat which has been stored up liberated from its confinement—which is always a necessary condition of its employment by man—and set at liberty to join its kindred energy which is free in the universe. For creation appears to consist in segregating and localizing force; and dissolution or death in setting this free. As this force

is shown to us under the form of heat, i. e., motion, the cooling of the earth sets free the greater part of its imprisoned energy. So another great portion is localized and individualized in the formation of vegetable matter which in its turn concentrates more and more the principle of motion to be employed by the subordinate intelligence for his creations. Thus all forms of life first segregate and afterwards set free some of this force which represents the matter of the universe. This process goes on perpetually until the supply of heat in the earth necessary for the processes of life have become exhausted when life itself must cease. For when there is no longer enough energy in the surface of the earth to enable life to support itself then animal existence must end. Just as in the human body when the temperature sinks permanently, and reaches an average through the system below that necessary to keep the life current fluid, the animal dies. So the earth itself when the temperature has sunk below that amount which sustains life will die also. For when the vital force of an organized being sinks below the power to sustain itself, then the body collapses, and this is death. The same analogy runs through all the world from the tiniest organization up to the entire earth itself. For each part seems to be a counterpart of the whole and the macrocosm is only the smaller type writ large.

Hence analogy leads us to expect that the earth herself will die. Life will retreat from the extremities as they by exhausting their proportion of energy shall grow cold, though at the heart nature will still continue the strife. But when there is no longer strength enough left to maintain the conflict the cheek of nature will fall in, her vital breath will expire and she will lie motionless and dead. The heat employed in doing its work has fled to join the immeasurable source which is free in the universe. None of this force, this motion, has been destroyed by being employed. It is energy reserved as a supply to be drawn upon for the Master's use. But

there can be no question that a time will come when the active forces of the earth shall cease. It will have grown so cold that there can be no further growth either of animal or vegetable organisms such as are now sustained. It is doubtless true that forms of life both of fauna and flora can develop under great cold, as in the coal period they did under high temperature. The edelweiss and lichen flourish among snow heaps. Polar bears, arctic foxes and seals sport among ice floes. But in neither case are the temperatures extreme. Yet there was a time when the activity of heat was so intense that no creature formed of organized material could endure the strain of its rapid motion in disintegrating; and so there could be no vegetable or animal life. So, on the other hand, we see that when the circulation becomes so sluggish that life at the extremities cannot cope with the invading cold, and the garrison after retreating to the inmost citadel, the heart, and there making its last desperate fight, has to succumb, and the body yields to the conqueror, death. Such has been the case already with the moon, and probably with other satellites of our system. There is not enough heat there to call forth either atmosphere or watery vapor. The air there has most probably become liquefied because there is not heat enough among the particles to expand them into gaseous form. In the same way the moisture there has no doubt congealed into ice of such coldness that frost at  $32^{\circ}$  would be vapor in comparison. The fire has retreated from the awful volcanic craters into the interior of the moon, and there growing less has no power to burn or give forth smoke. But heat that once made these volcanoes roar louder than Cotopaxi or Hecla—for their throats were at least ten times larger—has not been annihilated though it has abandoned its former place of activity. It, too, has joined the great mass of active or latent heat in the universe, whose place no science is daring enough to conjecture. It, too, awaits the Master's use.

As the effect of heat is to expand so that of cold is to contract and their action extends without any limits. Hence,

as the contraction of the gaseous matter forming the earth which when expanded filled the orbit of annual revolution, reduced it until its diameter is now 7,900 miles, so it may contract indefinitely. Hydrogen, the most attenuated substance known, can be contracted by cold until it is liquefied; and no doubt could by an increased intensity be frozen until it became as solid as granite. What the effect is of unlimited cold in contracting can be conjectured only by great stretch of imagination. But however much contracted any body might be by cold, none of the material would be lost by the process. So it could never disappear, how far soever the process might be carried. The body of the earth, though after many ages dead, is not thereby annihilated, neither is its substance destroyed judging from the analogy of the moon. All animal and vegetable organisms die and soon are dissolved. The mummy is embalmed in vain to resist decomposition. It may retain its ghastly features for thousands of years when under suitable conditions; but must finally collapse and disappear as an organism. But its material persists and is untouched by any of the changes to which its form is obnoxious. The materials which are embodied forces remain in their elements, ready to be taken up again into new organisms. But there must be something more than decay, than attrition, "the mountain falling," before it can come to naught. For none of the processes of decay appear to reduce matter to its constituent forces. The bodies of animals and vegetables when they decay to the utmost extent still remain elements which are apprehensible by the senses of sight and touch. Some more energetic process is necessary to change them from material elements to their constituent forces. If they are capable of interchange with their equivalents there must be an agent which can analyze them not into these elements—for that has already been effected by dissolution—but into the forces which these elements represent. The earliest form in which the constituents of the earth appeared was of matter most attenuated and the particles held



asunder by heat. Its gradual diminution allowed of condensation, and through the action of that which remained the principle of life integrated the materials when they had become sufficiently solid to be utilized in forming a bodily structure. This form of energy seems equally necessary when employed in adequate measures for both disintegrating and integrating, being alike attractive and repulsive. It seems as necessary for growth as for destroying, and we see its effects equally in both directions. It is the most perfect reagent known. It is that which is most commonly employed for what we consider utter destruction, and does its work in the speediest effective way of all known agents of decomposition. It comes very near in the ordinary way of action to reduce a substance to its original constituents. By a more energetic and careful application there is very little residuum of material. The chief constituents have been changed into imponderable agents, or to such materials as have been dissipated, or rendered capable of incorporation with other substances. Therein the specific agency of heat as motion by expansion is shown. For the burning process is one of separation. The material consumed is disintegrated by the repulsion of the particles as they expand, and this process continues until they are dissolved to such degree that no part of the original structure remains. It is true that there is a residuum in the forms of ash, cinder, smoke; but these diminish in proportion as the combustion is energetic; that is as the heat increases and the object is brought under its exclusive power. The gradual approach to perfect combustion may be seen in the cases of pure substances, such as carbon found in clean charred coal, and still more in the diamond. Hence by the analogy of *symptotes*, or gradual approach, we are justified in concluding that if the amount of heat were increased to the  $n$ -th degree, and the substance on which it was employed was to a like degree homogeneous, this would be changed entirely into the agent that separated

it. In other words the entire force which constituted the substance would be released from its confinement and become free energy. The processes of our analysis are always faulty, and there is a *caput mortuum* in the most perfect manipulations of chemistry. But in proportion to our accuracy of process is the approach to complete transference of material into force; so that if the process could be made perfect the transference would be without any remainder.

Under the action of intense heat refractory substances such as lime, which is itself a residuum after the combustible portions of the material holding it in combination have been driven off, may themselves be volatilized almost wholly. When this is done it is accompanied by the release of a prodigious amount of heat and light, which are correlatives of each other. This shows conclusively that heat is the equivalent of such substances as have themselves been freed from grosser accompaniments and brought nearer to the true constituents. So all analogy points to the hypothesis that matter when treated by a process the reverse of evolution or growth, would come back to the condition under which the material creation began, that is force in its equivalent, heat.

But when we arrive at the opposite pole of the creative process we find the material universe the farthest removed from the influence of heat. It has become so destitute that no life of any sort can be maintained. Instead of the expansion of matter to such degree that the sphere of its gaseous extent is supposed to have been equal to the whole of its orbit, the earth has already become less than 8,000 miles in diameter. This contraction will continue as long as there is any heat remaining to give off, and it is impossible to say how small our sometime living earth will have become. But it has then lost all its contractile capacity and has become as completely solid as gravity and cohesion can make matter.

But the heat which it has lost is not annihilated. For this is a force, *par excellence*, the force, and this cannot be destroyed. For all the power in the universe is conserved and

exists somewhere. All the heat set free by the cooling and condensation of the matter has been retained and exists in a free state, awaiting the command of Him who has authority over the powers of nature. And the amount of heat, sufficient to expand the particles of which the earth is composed into a fluid or gaseous state, would be sufficient to reduce it back to the same condition if it be applied thoroughly to the whole mass. At its first material existence it was the nearest to the dividing line between spirit and matter—now it is the poles apart from that condition. All that constituted it once existed in the equivalent of heat. Hence the same amount when restored to the substratum—in which it once had a local and material existence by combination—would reduce it to the same condition as before. And it is a well established and very curious principle in nature that the greater the contrast between two qualities, or the substances which involve them, the readier they unite. The more intense the opposition the greater eagerness for combination. This is seen most especially in the opposite forces of electricity, which is doubtless the purest form of heat or power with which we are acquainted. Either in the clouds or in the Leyden jar when the opposition between the two species or correlations of the electric fluid waxes intense, it is difficult to keep them apart. And this opposition may become so powerful that no force known by observation of the natural process or in the laboratory of science can keep them asunder. So in general the most intense opposition between any chemical elements insures the strongest combination. We might carry this comparison farther by instancing the irresistible affinity which diverse characters or bodily temperaments have for each other, in the intercourse between the sexes, through which the best products are produced by crossing. The facts are quite the reverse of the principle claimed for natural selection in which similar characteristics are combined. For the destruction of species follows close breeding of like qualities—all of which goes to show that we have the paradox, when things are most in opposition

they are the nearest to reunion. Hence, when the earth, and with it all similar members of the material universe, had become the most diverse conceivable from the condition of heat, motion, and life, they would, by the analogies of nature which we are permitted to understand, be in the state most likely to secure a reversal. The earth has become absolutely cold and dead. The living energies have all departed, but by doing so are not lost. Their equivalents, power or energy, are all conserved and are able to effect again what they did before. The heat which volatilized the material of the universe is still in existence and can change this into the state it was when the process of condensation began. The extreme opposition between the material in its ultimate condition of condensation and its former one of volatilization, offers no difficulty to the reverse process.

Now whether this be done by a specific act of a transcendent Creator or by the intervention of laws according to which the eternal architect works; or by immanent force directed by an intelligence inseparable from the material through which it works—there is no difference so far as regards the facts of formation or evolution and its counterpart dissolution. The heat when applied to the matter of which the world is made can reduce it to its primordial elements whatever they may be, such as they were when the process of phenomenal creation began. This statement is justified by the incontestible law that action and reaction are equal. The principle of the conservation of force has faithfully guarded all the heat, the motive power in the universe; and this energy is ready to do the bidding of the transcendent personality which called it into phenomenal action.

How far the contraction of the earth might go by the increase of cold can have no fixed limit. We are prone to make our standards of measure and apply them by the aid of sense perception. But of course such measurements vary constantly with the increase of knowledge. It is but a short time since the atmosphere in the frigid zone furnished our extreme stand-

ard of cold. For the chemical process as then understood could not produce as great a degree as was actually found in the extreme north by atmospheric action. More recently chemistry has been able to produce an intensity of cold utterly unknown in the natural world. And yet the extreme degrees, whether of heat or cold, which have been produced by chemical means are effected by employing the powers of nature already mastered by science. But no blowpipe can produce a more intense heat than exists all the time a few miles below the surface of the earth. And as we approach the center there is an intensity exceeding, no doubt, the stretch of the imagination. And yet this degree was actually surpassed in the primeval condition of the earth when its most obdurate materials were in a state of incandescent gas. These facts justify us in concluding that when the limit of human processes has been reached we have not exhausted nature's resources. Hence we hold that the contraction of the earth by cold may reach the  $n$ -th degree of condensation. But like all expressions of the  $n$ -th limit in number or quantity, this is reached at infinity; so that there must be a bound at some point where all expressions of this number will be reached. Hence the contraction of the earth will cease eventually. But the amount of material will be as great in the universe as heretofore, though the diameter of the earth be reduced until it be infinitesimal. And when this condensation shall have ceased then expansion by some means will begin again since nothing in the universe is "in one stay." How the treasured heat shall be applied cannot be even conjectured. But that this whole amount is still in existence is undeniable. That it is sufficient to burn up the earth and reduce it to dust or gas will not be disputed because the material once existed in that form; and only ceased to be such by giving out that which kept the particles asunder. Whether the reverse process be instantaneous or gradual the effect would be the same. Possibly the earth would undergo a reverse process by which through gradual expansion it would come into a

habitable condition, and reproduce again by special creation, or by development of immanent forces all the fauna and flora which have clothed and enlivened its surface. The process would be creation as surely as though by special behest of a transcendent Creator. In that case there would come a time when the heat would be too great for any kind of life. Ferns and palms would be dried up. Lizards and salamanders would succumb. Water would be changed first into clouds which would rain incessantly until the atmosphere had become too hot to allow condensation into drops. The visible clouds with their dark masses would be changed into transparent vapor so sublimated that it could never fall to the earth's surface, now a sea of furious fire waves swept by burning winds. This would be the evolution process reversed. It would require time for its working. But of the eternity to come there is no limit as there was none *a parte ante*. Eternity is long enough for the completion of the process, however slow. But it seems more probable that the destruction of the world by heat will be instantaneous. Should the earth meet another body near its own size both would be not merely set on fire by the impact, but swept out of bodily existence in a moment of time. Unconscious of what obliterated it from the firmament it would leave only a puff of smoke in infinite space. The feather or flock of cotton when cast into the furnace of the monstrous engine, the wisp of straw fired by a flash of lightning, may give us some faint picture of a world consumed in a moment, by letting loose the energies stored up in the universe upon one of the planetary family.

The agency of fire is invoked to destroy things that are corrupt. The noxious vapor is consumed by the intense heat, and the air rendered salubrious by the lightning's flash. Fires are employed in sanitary cremation, whether of the human body which has collapsed, or of the garbage which threatens the health of the city. The foulest substances are literally and figuratively sublimated by intense heat. The filthiest matter may be changed into the purest and least

noxious gases, or into the choicest perfumes. After the earth has accomplished her day as a hireling she must rest from her labors. In order to do this effectually she must be relaxed. The very framework must be dissolved; her materials must be reduced to their elements; and these in turn to the forces which they represent. The religious ideas of every system disclose the view that the earth through its inhabitants has become too corrupt to be continued any longer. It must be renovated, and in order to do this it must be destroyed. It must be burned up and the elements of which it is composed "must melt with fervent heat." The star-studded firmament, the heavens and the earth vanish as the scroll which shrivels and rolls up at the scent of fire. Both David and the Sibyl, both science and revelation declare that the earth is to be destroyed by fire. The revelation of the Jewish and Christian scriptures is most explicit. We have seen that from the point of view which science justifies, it is not only possible but likely that all visible material will return to its primeval condition.

The motions in nature seem all to be undulatory. Light moves in waves. The blood of living animals courses through the veins by pulsations. Earthquakes move by undulations just as the waters of the sea which cannot rest. All motion in the physical world seems to be dependent on the undulatory method. There cannot be long continued and steady motions in one direction, but it must be followed by counter and co-ordinate movement. Hence the growth of a world is one mighty pulse beat of nature; and its decay again, or rather its change, is the rebound, the counterpart of its forward or growing movement.

The power of fire to cleanse is well known and universally applied for that purpose; but it is still further employed for separation between that which is valued and the scoria or dross with which it is found connected. Most of the arts of life are wholly dependent upon its agency, and the analogies growing out of its purifying power are innumerable. While



the references in revelation to the manner in which the material universe shall be changed through the agency of heat may not be fully understood—doubtless we are not now capable of their comprehension, and must wait till the knowledge is needed before it is bestowed—still we can at least see from present mental grasp the propriety of the dissolution of all things by fire. We are not, however, to conceive of the sacred writers employing the explanation because of the known uses of fire. This is a charge brought habitually by unbelief that use provides the means and anticipates the purpose, than which can be more contradictory to human industry—or absurd in itself. Fire has the specific quality of dissolving and purifying, and because of its essential nature being made the agent of the world's change was employed by revelation to express the method by which this is effected. But the sacred writer did not have scientific knowledge sufficient to express this profound truth; and did not understand his own message; which is doubtless the case with every prophecy which ever was uttered. Neither did his contemporary audience comprehend his message. If this were the case with both prophet and hearer there would be little occasion for the message as prophecy; for it would in effect already be history. And had the message in relation to the end of the world been expressed in exact scientific language, neither speaker nor hearer would have been able to receive it. But this is not confined to matter of prophecy. Had the phenomena of the universe, as set forth in the *Système du Monde* been presented to Pythagoras or Plato they would have been an idle tale, because the ignorance of astronomy at their day absolutely precluded its comprehension. Prophecy and the power of transcendent genius, which is akin to it, necessarily anticipates the knowledge not merely of the specific facts—otherwise there is no occasion for it—but also the historical or scientific setting in which they take their place when their appointed time arrives. But when that time comes the fact can be comprehended because the condition of the world,

including the advance in knowledge, has prepared the way.

Hence when revelation anticipates the destruction of the world—a fact utterly beyond the grasp of the writer and contrary to the modes of thought not only of himself but his audience—this does not make use of the ordinary means employed for effecting its purposes, as must be the case if common usage suggested the message. But a higher wisdom which views each part of the world and of time in its relation to the whole extent is invoked. The end, being not merely foreseen but provided for, is brought about by the gradual development through the use of appropriate means. The bird's wing was constructed by Divine wisdom in order that it might fly—not the desire and effort preceded the apparatus—for if this was done by mechanical causation alone every effort to use an instrument, so far from developing its powers and increasing its organs, would wear them out. So the eye was formed with all its exquisite adaptations, “in the sacred recesses of the womb, in utter darkness far away from the environment of light”:\* formed that it might see, and not as the result of a struggle through infinite periods by inert matter acting through blind impulses. Surely the scientific expounder of a system by mechanical causation without teleology has shown himself a fool in trying to expel God from his creation! But to return: The agency of fire is disclosed by prophecy to be the means chosen to destroy the organized universe after it has completed the purpose of its life, and reduce it to its primordial elements. But the destruction of the organized system is not intended to be the annihilation of its materials, or their equivalent forces. The formation of a new heaven and a new earth will be through the exercise of that sapient wisdom and power which created the previous universe. The destruction of the old will be effected in consequence of two reasons which science can comprehend, and also concur in as corroborative of revelation. For it should be understood once for all in such discussions

\* Trendelenburg, *Log. Untersuch.*, Vol. II., Der Zweck.

as these, that there is no discord between science and revelation. As far as these sources of knowledge are concerned they are counterparts of each other; and though when imperfectly understood may be hostile, yet in reality are mutually corroborative. This must necessarily be the case. For they proceed from the same source; though in passing through human instrumentality their "dry light" may be discolored by the medium. Science discloses to us the sovereign agency of heat, both as a creator and destroyer. The analogies of human experience demonstrate these facts. The theories of science in world-building involve the same prevailing truth. And so far as we can follow the process it is heat which disintegrates, destroys, and purifies. Here is a difficulty in the way of application to the "final catastrophe," to use Clifford's name for the end of the universe. The gradual loss of heat causes a contraction of the material rather than any disintegration, or even dispersion. Nor is there destruction of anything except life or growth. And however far the process of cold be carried the matter remains intact in its equivalent force, and undiminished in its quantity. There must, therefore, be some other process for disintegration and dissolution. If the development theory be accepted here as it seems to be the process of nature in all her works, and which allies itself to the doctrines of revealed religion most closely—provided we assume here a guiding purpose, as we must in all acts of men when directed by intelligence—the decay and death of a universe is merely carrying out, on a grand scale, the natural trend which we see in constant experience. The world is developed from germs through the integration of materials, and the processes of life which build up organs. It has its childhood, youth, maturity, age decay; and finally the fate of all material things. It lives its day. It dies because the breath of life can no longer abide where the heat has sunk below that degree which allows the circulation of blood; that is its energy for self-preservation. This material world was good in itself; supremely good at its first creation. But it

became the abode of creatures which by their free action polluted it and filled it with misery. For "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain" because of the wickedness of the rational occupants who had the power of choice between good and evil in their actions. They polluted its surface and perverted its forces to unholy uses. By their actions they became an insufferable burden, so that the earth cried out to her Maker\* against the wickedness of those who had the knowledge and power to pervert her forces. The Cyprian verses testify to the depravity of man as clearly and drastically as Jeremiah, Ezekiel or Paul. They represent the earth as reduced to such extremity that she cried out for redress to Jupiter against the inhabitants. So, from the blood shed by the unnatural brother which polluted the ground and raised its cry to heaven, all along the ages the earth became such a habitation of cruelty and sink of pollution that nothing could wash its foulness away except a flood of water which swept off every living thing. In this way there was prepared a clear arena for a new experiment of man's conduct and care of his earthly habitation. The result is worse even than before. Man has been reduced to a single family, and the fate of the destroyed would seem enough to teach him wisdom. But not so. He multiplies in numbers and increases in wickedness. The earth cries out against him for relief from those who corrupt every force and material until another destruction is called for. Before, this was only partial, extending to the surface and those who dwelt upon it. Now the destruction must be complete because the very materials, as it were, of the world have been desecrated to such extent that only entire disintegration would suffice for purification. This, it may be said is not a scientific exposition. The Cyprian verses embody a myth; and the scriptural account is an insoluble mystery. These have been introduced not as an exposition of the facts of science; but as an evidence that the highest conceptions of human genius are coördinate with the

\* Cyprian verses, I., with Scholiast.

administration of the Divine action in the fate of the world.

To return to the intimations of science, let us apply our ear to nature and strive to hear and interpret the whispering which her material history utters for our guidance in comprehending the secrets of her destiny.

The surface of the earth that is the phenomenal, having become polluted must be changed altogether. Its essence or matter, the force or energy and the form of their embodiment, are incapable of harm. They cannot be touched by any agency save that of the power that created them by transforming some of His own energy. Whatever could be affected by the free and responsible being in whose care it was placed, and which by his offence has been polluted, will be destroyed in order that the essential nature be retained. Development always contemplates improvement; a rising in the scale of being. It assumes immanent or transcendent optimism according to the view entertained of personal or impersonal agency. This fact should not be overlooked. For evolution either openly or surreptitiously assumes an advance, not a retrogression. The *Homo Troglodytes* becomes *Homo Sapiens*, not *vice versa*. But there cannot be any change from inferior to superior without passing through dissolution of the more imperfect type. Except the corn of wheat die it cannot produce life and growth. Hence science demands the death of the first world before the materials can be in a condition for the evolution of a second, a higher one in the stage of being. The analogy between the consummate fruit of science and the doctrines of revelation is complete. The earth grows old as the result of its exhausted energy. The heat which constitutes its life is dissipated throughout the universe, and the material world grows weak and dies of decrepitude. This death is preparatory to another supreme effort, through which the forces which remain intact shall be first separated from the material forms with which they are connected and then be in a condition for a new and higher employment. The dissolution must be by

fire, the only reagent which is able to reduce the material to its equivalent energy. Of course the process of development does not stop. The advocates of this theory do not utilize the possibilities of their doctrine. They make development stop with each individual. They do not grant him another life. They are less consistent than Brahmanism which demands an endless progression of avatars. For they make the character, which is the created product of the man himself, his capital, so to speak, to do business with increasing efficiency, to stop its progress forward since they believe his individuality to be annihilated. Contrary, therefore, to their fundamental doctrine in science the conservation of energy, and which they hold with irresistible tenacity so far as material and physical force are concerned, they abandon to destruction the most powerful factor in the history of the world. This should live if they are consistent. For no force is lost, and by development we continually

" \* \* \* Rise from stepping stones  
Of our dead selves to higher things."

It would seem that evolution should not stop at the point where the species has risen to its culmination on earth. For the earth herself does not cease to exist, nor her energies to be active. They both pass through transitions; but this is necessary wherever there is a stepping from lower to higher. The earth through the development of the individual man has outgrown itself, has burst its swaddling bands, and requires a new field with improved environment wherein to employ the forces already gained in the lower stage. The species has become different in quantity though not in kind through "survival of the fittest," that is the better qualities of the soul have asserted their superiority and are now ready for their place in the higher order of species to which they have risen. They have outgrown their former status and become fitted for advancement. The earth, too, has passed through ma-

turity to age. It has finished its work. It has exhausted its concomitant energy and must pass through the transition stage. This as science shows us was through heat when it was evolved from the chaos of materials and forces into the cosmos with organic structure and amenable to uniform law. The earth must be dissolved before it can be reconstructed on lines of development, and furnish a place for the enlarged energies of him who is put in charge of its destiny. The doctrine of revelation is consistent. It does not teach development up to an arbitrary point and then abandon its own system.\* It tells us that the earth and heavens, that is the visible heaven, shall be burned up;\* that the elements shall melt with fervent heat and shall be changed.† They shall not be destroyed, but continue as the basis of a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. There is no decay in the powers by which the universe is constituted. But there is progressive excellence. For in the new heaven and the new earth, there shall no more be found aught that defiles or transgresses the laws of its being.

The origin of sin, or the possibility of wickedness arising in a world created by an infinite and holy God is not the matter before us now. We take the facts as they are disclosed in the world, that man has both the power and exercises the choice, to do wrong; and as a result the earth has grown so corrupt that it must be renovated. In the language of pure science this would mean that the world grows old even as any of its creatures do; that it must die even as the individual must perish in order for there to be an advance in excellence. Such advance is the order of nature witnessed on every hand and within the reach of personal experience by every rational and responsible creature. But experience shows also the power to retrograde. The man can destroy himself. He can cast away power voluntarily until his energy for good work is gone. He is, therefore, dead, and is fit only for dissolution.

\* II. Pet. 3: 10-13.

† Ps. CII: 26.



Nay, more: He defiles all he touches. This badness affects the world around him to such degree that the ground is cursed for his sake. He renders it an unfit place for those who struggle to keep themselves clean, and seek a pure atmosphere to breathe. From a moral point of view, just as from a scientific, the world must be renovated. To the scientist and the devotee of religion these results proceed from different causes. But they agree in the necessity for a new sphere of action. Those who have made progress should have environment suitable for their increased capacities. Hence all nature about them, material as well as spiritual, should be conducive to their higher development.

After the destruction of the world by fire or by any agency adequate to change the material into its equivalent force, several questions meet us: Will the force remain such forever, or will it again be developed through the same process as before for the formation of worlds? Is creation a process which occurs once for all; or is it a never-ending act? Is it a constantly reverberating action to continue forever after the manner of pulsation? These questions cannot be answered except conjecturally, and by analogies which must be traced with caution and employed with modesty.

It is of interest to our subject to recur to the process of creation as embodied in the Hindoo mythology. This system is indeed grossly pantheistic, and therefore very repulsive to a believer in a transcendent creator who is also a distinct personality. Brahma as the supreme god is represented as developing the universe from his own substance in the same way as the spider spins its web out of itself. This is not an instantaneous process but one long continued, extending for the definite period of 4,320,000 years, when the work is complete. The conditions of time and space are involved in the production. Some of the parts of the universe are created earlier as a necessary consequence of this method of production. But while they are finished earlier they are also reduced to the primeval state earlier; so that the life for

each portion would be of the same length. This period of activity of Brahma is called his day; and when his day's work is done, like another workman he is wearied, and requires rest. The reverse process commences forthwith, and the first objects formed are first reabsorbed into the bodily structure of the *Demiourgos*; and this process continues for a period equal to that of the creation. This is Brahma's sleep, and at the end of the long undisturbed slumber the whole universe has again returned into the substance of the Master Builder. By this time he is refreshed, and rousing up like a giant from his slumber he begins again his task, which alternates between creation and absorption forever. This theory is interesting as being the product of a people second only to the Greek in the keenness of intellect, especially for abstract speculation. But it could have no weight with the western mind unless it presented strong analogies—which it does not with our experience—or was supported by divine revelation. It possesses neither sanction, and, therefore, can be regarded only as a fanciful picture of conceptions which rise spontaneously in a deeply reflective mind.

But will the progress of creation stop when the universe has been reduced by fire to its essential elements and forces? Will the unending ages of eternity be unoccupied with the phenomena of material worlds and organized, sentient beings? That the world as we know it is not eternal, is as certain as anything can be short of personal experience or abstract demonstration. For with the action of gravity which must be constant "the mountains falling would come to naught." Then the rivers flowing would carry down the detritus toward the sea, and all would become a dead level. We do not lose sight of the fact that mountains are raised by the action of internal heat. This process would for a time counteract the subsidence of elevations by the erosion of frost and water acting in concert with gravity. But the heat of the earth which is constantly radiating and dissipating in space would in the course of innumerable ages, reduce the temperature

of the whole mass so that there would be no expansive force left in the central parts to counteract the leveling causes which have been noted. Therefore there can be no question that if the earth had existed from eternity it would have become a dead level; with water or ice covering the entire surface, and no living thing, either fauna or flora, upon it. All must have died if endowed with constitutions such as living creatures of this or earlier ages are known to possess. That the earth, therefore, had a beginning in time, such as scientific men without exception attribute to it, and which is set forth expressly by revelation, will hardly be denied. That it is losing some of its vitality by the dissipation of heat at the surface around the poles is unquestionable. Whether the loss of some of its heat is an improvement by rendering the larger portions between the Arctic and Antarctic Circles habitable at the expense of the smaller ones above these lines, is worth considering. For on this decision will depend the fact whether the earth has already reached its maturity or is on the decline from age and growing weakness. But certainly the world in these respects is not stationary. It is unquestionably losing its heat. And as certainly the area of land rendered uninhabitable by the cold is increasing; though this may in part be counteracted by man, so far as his abode is concerned, by improved devices for producing artificial warmth. This action, however, has its limit. The coal supply of Great Britain according to Mill will be exhausted at the present rate of consumption in about two centuries. Increasing manufactures would hasten the result. In other countries, though the supply is relatively much greater compared with the consumption, the same truth still holds. Hence the work of man coöperates with the natural causes in hastening the cold senility of age to the world itself. It will, therefore, for this reason unless counteracted by miracle or some law of nature as yet undiscovered, become dead because it will not have heat enough to sustain living creatures

upon its surface, or carry on the functions of life in its own structure. The earth herself shows this in the fate of all the creatures which are sustained by her bounty. For there is a time to be born and a time to die; which indeed are only incidents of existence, and leave the continuance of force unaffected. The question, however, is not of continuance of force as the equivalent of phenomenal matter; but whether the world as an organism shall continue forever. There seems but one answer possible, either from revelation or science; which reply is distinctly in the negative.

Life is manifested by pulsations which are in the form of convulsive or orgastic movement and remission. This is seen distinctly in wave movements of heat and light; more obscurely but with undoubted certainty in vibrating action of terrestrial disturbances. The secret force, which controls large masses of matter, may be employed by man, provided he puts his efforts *en rapport* with them. As an illustration: the heaviest weight, the firmest column, may be set in motion by the application of the hand directly, or through mechanism. By repeated efforts made at changing intervals there can be effected a synchronous movement between the hand and the vibratory energy residing in any part of the earth's structure. Then a very slight force so applied is sufficient to set immense weights, or solid structures in rocking motion. Familiar examples of this may be seen in sailors heaving an anchor, or laborers effecting any work requiring concerted effort, but which is greater than can be achieved by the steady application of their united strength. The action is twofold. First of the men themselves, who by repeated trial get the proper "swing" to combine, and this acts in unison with the mysterious forces of nature. This principle seems to be of universal reach. The constancy of nature which, according to science, never proceeds *per saltum*, yet so far as life is concerned, is perpetually by effort and relaxation. In this manner forward and stationary movements are controlled. Orbicular motions among the planets in the heavens are con-

stant; but of things on the earth all is undulatory. Both movements may be seen in the wave theory of light, which is now the accepted one, and in the undulations of the sea. Light seems to proceed from the sun by emission; but in reality it sets the ether and atmosphere in motion, and this is conveyed in waves of varying rapidity, forming the colors of the spectrum. These are caused entirely by the action of the undulations in the material of transmission, which of itself has no forward movement. So in the motion of the water in the sea. When this is so deep that the movement is substantially free from the effect of the bottom, and when the wind does not drive the waves, there is no forward movement. Time is stationary, an Eternal Now; though the events in time, from the vibration of light in forming the scarlet ray, to the evolution and decay of the universe—all are effected by pulsation, exhibiting a progression and regression by which the two are equalized.

These illustrations are simply analogical, and are intended to show that all nature is controlled by precisely the same principles. And we see our existence from the single pulsation and the act of respiration to the whole extent of our earthly sojourn: it is life, death, growth, decay, advance, retreat, transition, permanency. Activity is followed by rest, the brightness of day by the darkness of night; the heat of summer and the cold of winter, as the pulsations which beat out our lives and the life of the earth. Hence we conclude, judging the large by the small, applying the dialectic of experience where we can see to the dialectics of nature through all time and all extent. The "woods decay, the woods decay and fall." But they are renewed each spring, and by the sucker which grows out of the decaying stump. The earth itself is born, lives and dies. The organism is destroyed, the material remains either as substance or force, resting, yet active; "dying yet behold it lives."

Therefore we conclude that there will be a constant recur-

rence of creation and decay of worlds of systems, absolutely forever. All analogies drawn from science point unmistakably in that direction. We see growth followed by decay; and the abiding substance and force remaining unharmed reappear in new and increasingly perfect forms. For the design of nature coöperating with its offshoot as found in human intelligence, shows a constant improvement in the combined production. Both the fauna and flora of the world show increasingly beautiful and efficient forms when under the fostering care of nature's minister. And if this be the case under a finite intelligence subject to the restraints of environment, then, *a fortiori*, when under the absolute control of Omniscient Intelligence and Almighty Power. A vista of solemn grandeur arises before the enraptured vision. A succession of earths and suns, of systems and universes, extending through boundless space and for the countless æons of God's Day. The matter of one sublimated into force, so that whatever of pollution or imperfection there may be, is eliminated! Perfection itself being a relative term the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness—being expressions adapted to our humble capacity of thought and language—will be the sphere for action of beings rational and increasingly holy; ever approaching but never reaching a complete likeness to the Infinite God!

The doctrine of the conservation of energy has reference to the preservation of that already in existence so that shall never be diminished. But this does not prevent the increase of physical energy, or of phenomenal worlds as organs for its employment. "My Father worketh hitherto and I," the Creator of the earth, "also work." The power and wisdom in the Supreme Being are not diminished, much less exhausted when the six days' works were finished. This revelation of the Divine Power no doubt referred to one of those periods of activity; one of those vibrations or pulsations which denote an effort in progress, and was followed by a day of rest. For the Lord of Nature sets the example

for the rest needed by His creatures, whether rational or irrational, organic or inorganic. But this no more limited the continuance of the Creator's activity than the completion of the day's work or the year's task precludes the renewal of the labor for the like period which succeeds. Hence whatever motive induced the Father of All to transfer his energy into the phenomenal being would continue, since the power is exhaustless by utilizing, and the goodness by dispensing. It is certainly true that the process of creation when applied to moral agents shall go on forever. For the growth of character is not only a continued new creation, but it is done by a constantly increasing number of actors in the process. The soul is given into the keeping of each human being, and the spiritual personality entrusted to each created being of a higher order with the injunction: "Occupy till I come." That soul or spiritual personality is capable of growth, development, which can be effected only by itself; or at least, not without its coöperation. The increments being its own can be effected in no other way than by its own creative powers. For if transferred voluntarily by another, this would properly belong to the one who bestowed it. If violently wrested this would neither change the ownership before the bar of exact justice, nor it become a part of the essential nature of the agent that merely exercised but did not produce the acquired force. Hence the growth of character in responsible being—and no other can have a character constituting a personality—is a new creation; and of this process and product there is no limit. This is a thought which overwhelms us by showing the responsibility which is involved for weal or woe in the free action of each person. There is on the one hand a constant approach, but a veritable asymptote of the moral nature of men and angels to the Eternal God in capacity for beneficence and happiness. New souls will be born into existence continually. For in the new created worlds the populating may be by natural generation. It is only said of those who have completed their earthly discipline that



there shall be no more unions such as earthly marriage. This life being for a specific purpose in each case, there will be no need of a repetition of that discipline when it has accomplished its appointed work. But in other worlds, in other creations, as well as the successive *avatars* of this universe, such as the unending activity and goodness of the Supreme Being may call into existence, there may be—analogy would teach—there must be, a multiplication of materials to constitute new worlds, and of spirits who shall occupy them. But there can be no question as to the growth of moral character, or that this increment is the new creation. Hence the servants of God shall serve him with an ever increasing desire and capacity for action, which in time will call for a growing width of the sphere of their activities. Accordingly the eternal development of the personal character, and the multiplication of agents so employed will call evermore for new heavens and new earths as the habitations of God's growing family; and for the increasing capacities of each one—without end.

The extent of the universe and the littleness of the earth are heightened by the contrast. The moment of time represented even by the lifetime of a world is as nothing compared with the illimitable ages which will follow after. Time has grown old and nature sunk in years. Man with all his angelic powers seems like the small dust of the balance when weighed against the Omnipotent God who made and sustains this boundless universe of suns and worlds. Yet the small abides by the side of the great, having an assured existence and sphere of action. Man has the Divine breath in his body; and by the ordinance of Omnipotence has gained a foothold in the earth and an unending lease on the reality of time. For like every other force or material, his personality or its exclusive representative is indestructible. The two shall live forever, and witness the birth and death of worlds. He has been dignified so grandly as to be made a co-worker with the Almighty Creator. How great is the dignity with which man

is dowered! This range of vision\* shall increase *pari passu* with the widening horizon, until it shall embrace all time and range through all space.

Everything now seems transitory. Sickness, decay and death claim their constant tribute. Nations rise and pass away. Cities and other works of men occupy the face of the earth. Anon they are covered with the drifting sand, and their palaces become the lairs of wild beasts. The earth and the heavens wax old as a garment, are folded up and laid away.† Seeing that all these things shall be dissolved, that the elements shall melt with the fervent heat; the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up, what manner of persons ought we to be? For we, as having an abiding existence, enlarging forever in capacity, still remain eternally the same personality. Life, therefore, becomes invested with an inconceivable greatness and solemnity; because to man is entrusted the formation of a character which none but himself can build up and must remain his conscious personality amid all the convulsions of nature. He can make himself happy and sharing in the destiny which rises evermore in the scale of excellence and more identified with that power which controls the universe. The pulsations of nature beat out the creation and dissolution of worlds. But his sphere of action is the boundless universe; and his time of increasingly fruitful service coeval with the years of the everlasting God.

\* "Let knowledge grow from more to more."—"In Memoriam."

† II. Pet. II. 10-11.

## VII.

### EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

#### LEO XIII. AND THE PAPACY.

By the death of Joachim Vincent Raphael Ludovico Pecci Catholicism has lost one of its great Popes. This is the judgment of Roman Catholics and Protestants. The former rank him with popes like Innocent the third and Benedict the fourteenth. The latter have praised him as a 'leader of the great army of the Lord's host,' a 'Spiritual commander-in-chief,' a 'champion of the faith who has never wavered from the Catholic position and the theology of Thomas Aquinas,' 'who has done much for the progress of civilization' and 'who has restored the golden age of the papacy in its best sense.' Few Protestants would be bold enough now to call the last pope 'that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition.' For some reason or other there has been a great change in the attitude of Protestantism toward Romanism and the papacy. Such an outburst of appreciation and sympathy for a Roman Pontiff, though he had been so excellent a man as Leo, would not have been possible fifty years ago.

This change of attitude is felt not only in the relation of Protestantism to Romanism but, also, in the relations between Protestant denominations themselves. It is due to the spirit of toleration which is characteristic of this scientific age. Intolerance is an evidence of a want of culture and is unscientific. Whether this is a sign of progress or retrogression has been questioned by intelligent men. The *New York Sun* traces "this new spirit of tolerance" to "lessened religious conviction." In the past men were intolerant but they were sincere. Their narrowness was an

index of their depth. The warring factions of Protestantism arose for conscience's sake. Though men were willing to burn heretics, they were no less willing to be burnt for their orthodoxy. There may be an element of truth in this theory. Tolerance may be the result of indifference and breadth may be a sign of shallowness. Whenever that is the case the liberal attitude of Christians is deplorable. But there are other reasons for present-day fellowship between the Churches. We are coming to comprehend more than ever the essence of Christianity. The basis of Christian communion is no longer agreement in particular doctrines, forms of worship, or systems of polity but in the possession of the Christ life, of which ecclesiastical forms are only the expression and the servants. Even the advocates of dogmatic Christianity and the opponents of modern thought and culture are influenced by this view, if not by a process of argument, by the inter-denominational movements and associations in which they take part. As we labor together for souls we come closer together and find ourselves in agreement on the *purpose* of Christianity, if not on its *definitions*. Even Romanism, with all its errors and its antiquated ceremonies, may be the bearer of the Christian life into the souls of men and thus be, in that respect, one with Protestantism. By the acceptance of such ideas tolerance has arisen between the churches in the Kingdom of Christ.

Yet, while we admire the character of the Pope, who has passed away, and are inclined to be tolerant toward every branch of the Church Universal, we cannot fail to ask whether there have been any changes in the spirit of the papacy or in the ideals of the Roman Church which warrant a change of attitude among Protestants toward that institution. Were the fathers of the 16th, or of the greater part of the 19th, century justified in their suspicions, their hatred and their denunciations, of Roman Catholicism? While their language was bitter and often coarse we have reason to think that they were not altogether unreasonable and unjustified in their

inflexible antipapal attitude. They felt there was an irreconcilable difference between the principles of the Reformation and the Roman Catholic Church. If that was true then, have we reason to think that the policy of the papacy has changed and that the Church of Rome has in a measure been modified by the modern spirit? May we infer this from the words and deeds of Leo or of his predecessors since the restoration of Pius VII. after the fall of Napoleon? In order to answer these questions we must examine the papal ideals as well as the life of the lamented head of Catholicism.

We can only understand Leo when we view him in the light of the system which he represented. We can only regard him great as he was true to that system and advanced it in his generation. He had many qualities which made him an attractive personality. He was genial in his bearing towards all men. His sympathies were world-wide. He was thoroughly versed in the tendencies of modern life. He had his eye on the political, social, educational, and religious movements of the age. He was personally a devout man and no one doubts his sincerity. He had passed through a system of education, beginning in his childhood, which enabled him to stand among the leading scholars of his day. He was trained in ecclesiastical and political courts to become an executive and a diplomat, who could deal successfully with the Emperors, Kings, Presidents, and Prime Ministers of the nations. If the standard of greatness is the ability to direct the tendencies of an age, loyalty to one's principles, and intelligent sympathy with the culture of the past and present, Leo was a great man and a great Pope.

But Leo as a man and as a Pope was after all the organ of a greater institution in the bosom of which he was reared and as the head of which he reigned and died. The ultimate value of his life and his service for humanity will be determined by the principles which he upheld.

The Rome of the middle ages claimed universal monarchy. It is one of the boasts of that church that she is "*semper*

*cadem*," always the same. In the development of the papal claims we find several well-marked stages. The first struggle of the Roman Bishop was for supremacy over the hierarchy in the church. Since the days of Cyprian there have been those who considered the Bishop of Rome only first among equals, while there have been others who have yielded him supremacy over all Metropolitans and Bishops by virtue of his divine appointment as successor of Peter. The monarchical aspirations were formulated in the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals of the 9th century. These teach that the clergy are a divinely instituted caste mediating between God and the people, as in the Jewish dispensation. They are subject to no earthly tribunal. The privileges of the priesthood culminate in the episcopal dignity, and the episcopal dignity culminates in the papacy. The *Cathedra Petri* is the fountain of all power. The pope is called the "*episcopus universalis*," notwithstanding the earlier protest of Leo I. Schaff, Vol. 4, p. 269. While Catholic historians admit that this document was a forgery, they do not deny that it embodies the claims of the papacy.

But the Vicar of Christ did not limit himself to the control of the Church. In the person of Gregory VII. in the 11th century we have a pope who claims control of temporal powers. In his sentence against Henry IV. he makes the following statement: "Come, now I beseech you, O most holy and blessed Fathers and princes, Peter and Paul, that all the world may understand and know that if ye are able to bind and to loose in heaven, ye are likewise able on earth, according to the merits of each man, to give and to take away empires, kingdoms, principedoms, marquisates, duchies, countships, and the possessions of all men. For if ye judge spiritual things, what must we believe to be your power over worldly things? and if ye judge the angels, who rule over all proud princes, what can ye not do to their slaves?" The Hildebrandian ideals have not since been renounced. Both by public documents and by ecclesiastical and political transactions medieval and modern popes have striven to actualise

the ideal. It says little that they have failed thus far. Greek Christendom fell away from Rome. Protestantism has declared itself independent. The new nations have resisted ultramontane interference. Yet the ideal of a universal monarchy remains. It can be traced in the acts of Innocent III., in the Bull *Unam Scantam*, and in the attitude of the Church in the 16th century. Let the opportunity come and the Pope will not only claim the sovereignty of the papal states in Italy but the supremacy over the temporal and spiritual rulers of the earth.

The Roman Church passed through two crises in the modern period, in each of which she was challenged to renounce her medieval principles and to readjust herself to modern conditions. The first was the time of the Reformation, the second the time of the Restoration after the fall of Napoleon. But in both instances she remained the immovable bulwark of conservatism and pronounced the ban upon modern religious and political movements.

The Council of Trent with its Decrees and Canons was the answer of Rome to Protestantism. Scripture and tradition were coordinated as the source of truth. The apocrypha of the Old Testament were declared canonical and the Vulgate was made the authoritative edition of the Scriptures. The doctrine of transubstantiation before and after the use of the elements was affirmed. The mass, indulgences, penance and purgatory were advocated though in a cautious and indefinite way.

By the adoption of the Decrees and the Canons with their '*Anathema sit*' the Church of Rome declared herself to be the church of sacrifice, priest, and sacrament. She withdrew from the struggle which the Reformers precipitated in order to reach an inward understanding of religion and turned her back on the social, political, intellectual, and religious aspirations of a new age. This conservative position was doubtless taken, as her leaders imagined, in the interest of true religion,



which sincerity does not commend her attitude any the more to the enlightened conscience of the present.

The religious principles of the Reformation had political significance. Protestantism, when consistently applied, wrought changes in every department of human life. The false tendencies, which always accompany a true movement, bore fruit in the French revolution and the reign of Napoleon. Pius VII., elected in 1800, was for various reasons friendly toward Napoleon. He formed a concordat with him and crowned him emperor. But their friendship ended in a quarrel. Pius was arrested in 1809 and kept a prisoner at Savona and Fontainebleau. While his master was retreating to the Island of Elba, the pope freed from his prison entered Rome with plaudits of a victorious emperor. The papacy was now stronger than ever. Rome again was "the paradise of artists, the mecca of princes, the favorite stepping-stone of future statesmen." Gervinus says: "It was the deep humiliation, the long misery, of the church herself, that had changed public feeling in her favor; she who had once been feared had become an object of pity and sympathy." The principle of absolutism in the state, which had been jeopardized by the revolutionary measures and the Napoleonic conquests in Europe, found its greatest representative in the Pope. "The restored dynasties met the renewed Papacy with even greater sympathy. The principle of the solidarity of throne and altar had become the accepted doctrine, and the Bourbons of France, Spain and Naples, and the King of Sardinia outdid one another in their devotion to the Holy See." Nippold, *The Papacy in the 19th Century*.

With the powers at her feet the Roman Church now more than ever might have placed herself at the head of the conservative and progressive tendencies of the age. She could have mediated between monarchy and constitutionalism, tradition and science, authority and freedom. But true to her ancient genius and her doctrine of immutability she turned a deaf ear to the demand for the reconciliation of the old with

the new. She had no place for constitutions and democracies. Scholarship was only safe when guided by the hand of Holy Mother Church. As in the 16th century the light shone and she comprehended it not, so in the 19th she failed to recognize the legitimacy of the cry for recognition of new ideas from a rapidly increasing portion of mankind. The reason for this attitude toward the people is given by Gervinus, who says: "The papacy was by its whole tendency since the Reformation too closely identified with opinions opposed to popular wishes, and the dominant liberalism was intimately associated with a freer way of thinking in religion; for the enjoyment of political liberty led to the desire of ecclesiastical liberty, and among a free people no limits could be set to enlightenment. Thus the restored Papacy must consistently with its own character assume a reactionary attitude towards all the popular aspirations of the time." The nineteenth century, accordingly, is a period in which the Popes and the Curia have put forth every effort, by Jesuitic politics, complaining encyclicals, and papal decrees, to suppress every form of democracy in Church and State and to regain the lost ground for the See of St. Peter.

The policy of Pius VII. was to obliterate all traces of the revolution and the Napoleonic rule. The old order in Church and State was to be restored. In order to effect such a restoration he had recourse to the dissolved Society of Jesus. Their dissolution by Clement XIV. he considered a sacrifice to the spirit of liberalism. He accordingly issued the Bull *Sollicitudo Omnium* Aug. 7, 1814, and revived the Order. We may understand the significance of this act, when we consider the statement of Nippold, who says: "It is no exaggeration to say that modern national development hinges upon the national attitude towards the Jesuits; for the order or against the order is the Shibboleth of contemporary history. Moreover, in the future the history of the Jesuits and that of the Papacy may be treated as one and the same." Bishop Wessenburg, who was a liberal Catholic and whose crime was the advocacy

of a national church in Germany, the revival of general councils, and the introduction of the German language into the liturgy and choir singing of the churches of his diocese, foretold the consequences of the restoration of the Jesuits in words like these: "Its principles are of such nature that they must inevitably corrupt Christian faith and morals and unsettle the relation of Church and State. All kinds of unbelief, heathen and Pharisaic opinions, are cherished by them. The doctrine of probabilities, of the *reservatio mentalis*, and the scantification of the means by the end, of the invalidity even of oaths, when a supposedly higher end makes this probable, and others which the order has invented and which it everywhere maintains, destroy the foundation of all Christian morals. The Jesuit-ultramontane doctrine of church-law is inconsistent with the maintenance of any real secular authority and with the independence of national government. For this order, true to its character and the spirit of its teaching, as the experience of centuries proves, aspires to universal despotism over all minds, over all organs of State and Church life, so that none but a stone-blind man can fail to see that this order is the most mighty and the most dangerous secret society for grasping the actual power of Church and State." Their restoration was far less popular among the states of Europe and even in Roman Catholic circles than the Pope anticipated. The secular clergy and the other orders, still remembering the past, looked upon them with suspicion. In Rome the hatred against the Jesuits manifested itself immediately. France and Germany disapproved of their revival. From Russia they were banished in 1820. In the decree of banishment the following causes for such action are named: "Their political wrangling, their proselytising, their peace-destroying intrusion into the family life of noble houses, the gross use they made of the weakness of the female sex."

The events, which followed their restoration in the papal reigns of the 19th century serve to show that Jesuitism was not merely a party in Catholicism but that it was the dominat-

ing factor. They accepted the task, implied in their revival, and began to work for the establishment of the pristine order of things. "They harshly and fanatically resisted all innovations and placed themselves in direct opposition to all ideas and demands of modern times" (Gieseler). Just as the old Jesuits opposed the Reformation and the new ideas arising out of it, the new Jesuits opposed the Revolution and all its principles. The former began the Counter-Reformation, the latter, the Counter-Revolution. In order to accomplish their work some radical measures were adopted in favor of papal absolutism. In Fribourg, Switzerland, a book was published in which the old doctrine of Moral Probabilism was once more taught without alteration. The Congregation of the Index forbade all political books. Before the Congregation of the Inquisition there were pending in a short time 724 charges of heresy. By a single edict 1824 monasteries and 622 nunneries were restored. Then followed the condemnation of secret societies and bible societies. The latter are called "a pest, godless machinations of innovators, a crafty invention to shake the foundations of religion. \* \* \* The translations of Holy Scripture in general do more harm than good, and none is to be tolerated which is not sanctioned by the Holy See and furnished with explanations by the Church-fathers." These societies have been condemned again and again by subsequent Popes.

The attitude of the Church toward modern science and scholarship is apparent from the Encyclicals issued since 1815. They are a series of Jeremiads against "infamous associations," "religious indifference" and "false science." In the Encyclical of 1832 Gregory XVI says: "The cause of existing wide-spread unbelief and of the revolt against the exclusively valid dogmas of the Church is a false science. Academies and schools are shockingly full of new abominable teachings, by which the Catholic faith is not only secretly and hiddenly opposed, but by which it is openly attacked in merciless warfare. \* \* \* Therefore, in order to keep such novelties from

the Church, we must insist upon it that to the pope alone belongs the right of judging concerning doctrine and the government of the whole church. \* \* \* But especially are we to fight against indifferentism or the illusion that one may be saved in any faith; from this is derived the insane idea that every man has a claim to liberty of conscience. \* \* \* Herewith is connected the injurious and thoroughly detestable freedom of the press, in consequence of which the most absurd and insipid doctrines and errors spread themselves with ease; and it is foolish to assert that the effects of bad writings are destroyed by written refutations. Therefore the Roman Index is a beneficent institution, and it is a grievous error to deny to the Church the right of the prohibition of books." A summary of the papal positions in regard to modern culture and non-Catholic Churches is found in the Papal Syllabus of Errors, issued by Pius IX. in 1864. Its form is purely negative, yet by implication it teaches the very opposite of what it condemns. It is printed in full in Schaff's *Creeeds of Christendom*, Vol. 2, p. 213. Many of the errors named are equally offensive to Catholics and Protestants. But the spirit that breathes through the Syllabus is Anti-protestant from beginning to end. For example it is considered an error to hold that "Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion in which it is possible to be equally pleasing to God as in the Catholic Church"; again, "that the Church ought be separated from the State, and the State from the Church"; "that in the present day, it is no longer expedient that Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship"; that "the Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism, and civilization as lately introduced." In regard to public schools it is declared an error to hold that "the entire direction of public schools, in which the youth of Christian States are educated \* \* \* may and must appertain to the civil

powers, and belong to it so far that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the taking of degrees, or the choice and approval of the teachers"; again, that "this system of instructing youth, which consists in separating it from the Catholic faith and the power of the Church, and in teaching exclusively, or at least primarily, the knowledge of natural things and the earthly ends of social life alone, may be approved by Catholics."

The last fruits of the policy of papal absolutism and opposition to modernism are the Decree of the Immaculate Conception promulgated by Pius IX. in 1854, and the Decree of Papal Infallibility enacted in the Vatican Council in 1870. The significance of the former decree was not so much its dogmatic contents, which of course Protestants could not accept, but the manner in which it was declared. The pope defined the new doctrine independently, without the cooperation of a council. Such a step had never been taken by any former pontiff. It was only a prefatory movement toward the Vatican Decree of Infallibility by which ecumenical councils were dispensed with forever. By his action in 1854 Pius IX. did not formally claim infallibility but practically claimed that prerogative, not simply as head of an ecumenical council but as inherent in his person and office.

The crown of the policy of Pius VII. and the restored order of Jesuits, which produced the Decree of the Immaculate Conception and the Syllabus of Errors, was logically reached in the adoption of the Decree of Infallibility. This decree was necessary to give permanent force to the principles of Jesuitism. In the chapter "the Power and Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff," a part of the Vatican decrees, we are told, that "full power was given to him (the Pope) in blessed Peter to rule, feed, and govern the universal Church by Jesus Christ our Lord. \* \* \* Hence we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a superiority of ordinary power over all other Churches, and

that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; to which all, of whatever rite and dignity \* \* \* are bound to submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor through the preservation of unity both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman Pontiff. *This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation.*" At the close of the definition of infallibility we read, "But if anyone—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition: let him be anathema."

The acceptance of an Infallible Pope had far-reaching significance within Catholicism itself and its relations to the various tendencies of the age. It was a final victory of papalism and Jesuitism over liberal Catholicism. The rights of the episcopacy and the General Council were denied and the absolute authority of the Pope was declared. The history of the Vatican Council clearly shows that the decree was bitterly opposed by a large number of the delegates. Some of these remained true to their convictions and started the Old Catholic Church, others made a sacrifice of their reason and submitted to the inevitable. Yet it is evident that it was a victory of a party rather than a voluntary act of the whole Church. A line of distinction can be drawn between Catholicism in its patristic and episcopalian sense and papalism in its Jesuitic form.

In relation to science and historic research infallibility is eternally hostile. In place of independent research obedience to the revelations of the pope is substituted. At the beginning of the 19th century there were numerous Catholic schools, especially in Germany, full of the spirit of independent research. But the Curia has suppressed them one after the other. Cardinal Manning cried, after the Vatican Council,



"Dogma has conquered history." Henceforth history has to be read in the light of dogmas. "Janus," Döllinger, on the eve of the Council, pointed out the one condition, if the dogma triumphed, namely, that all libraries should be burned and that the civilized nations should become strangers to all knowledge of their past, somewhat like the Maoris of New Zealand."

So far as the decree affects the citizen in the state we may quote the opinion of Mr. Gladstone, in an article entitled, "The Vatican decrees in their bearing on Civil allegiance." He cannot be accused of fanciful hatred and of impetuous judgments. He affirms the following propositions: 1. That "Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith. 2. That she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused. 3. That no one can now become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom and *placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another*. 4. That she (Rome) has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.

From these unambiguous statements in encyclicals and decrees the avowed attitude of the Roman Church toward the spirit of the modern age is antagonistic. Protestantism she can only recognize as a heresy and an apostasy. The Reformers and their followers are still under the ban. Whatever expression of interest and sympathy for Protestant lands or churches may come from Roman officials, they can only be made in the spirit of condescension and in the hope of winning back an erring child. The public school system, the free press, the separation of Church and State, and liberty of conscience, which are fundamental principles of Americanism, have been condemned without conditions. Republican forms of government, in which authority comes from the people, are directly contrary to the theory of divine right, whether claimed by emperor or pope. The Catholic citizen in all lands owes

allegiance to the Church, and the Church ought to have a voice in the temporal government of men.

Did Leo XIII. accept these ideals from his predecessors? Was his reign controlled by these principles? He always showed himself friendly to individuals and nations, regardless of creed or profession. His predecessors had come to a rupture with the German and Russian emperors. He at once expressed a desire to resume friendly relations with them. In his negotiations he constantly gave assurance of peace and thus won for himself the title of "Peace-Pope." In his later years he expressed the highest regard for America and allowed no opportunity to pass to laud this great Republic. He received protestant Emperors and Kings on their visit to Rome. As an executive and a diplomat he was their equal. In all these acts he was sincere, strove for the best interests of the papal church, and for the welfare of all mankind. But he lived under the influence of the policy of his predecessors and was out of sympathy with what Protestants consider some of the greatest achievements of history.

When he was still Bishop of Perugia, he wrote a pastoral letter in which he spoke of Protestantism as "a pest, the most pestilential heresy, a stupid, fickle system, originating in arrogance and godlessness." At another time he described the Reformation as "the insane war which since the 16th century has been waged by the innovators against the Catholic Church." The Evangelical schools in Rome were an eye-sore to the Vatican. He spoke of "the impudence without parallel with which in Rome even under the eyes of the Pope such schools were established, in which tender children were fed with abominable errors, and from which proceeded influences the most harmful and the most injurious to manners."

One of the most significant utterances in his reign was the third encyclical, 1879. In it he outlined the course of instruction in the schools and seminaries of the Church. The philosophy of Thomas Aquinas was made the foundation of all studies. He wrote: "Far above all other scholastic doctors

towers Thomas Aquinas, their master and prince. \* \* \* So far as man is concerned, Reason can now hardly rise higher than she rose, borne up in the flight of Thomas, and Faith can hardly gain more helps and greater helps from Reason, than those which Thomas gave her. We, therefore, exhort all of you, Venerable Brothers, \* \* \* to restore the golden wisdom of St. Thomas, and to spread it as far as you can, for the safety and glory of the Catholic faith, for the good of society, and for the increase of all the Sciences." Why this enthusiasm for a medieval philosopher? Has he forgotten that Kant lived, that men have thought and struggled after truth for nigh to a thousand years since Aquinas died? Was the effort of the great modern philosophers a vain pursuit of a will-'o-the-wisp, and must we now return to St. Thomas as our final authority? These questions may be easily answered when we remember that Thomas Aquinas "supplied the scholastic foundation of papal infallibility." The encyclical was, therefore, a natural consequence of the Vatican Council. It is the philosophy which lends itself to the monarchical claims in Church and State and thus becomes a rational foundation for the absolutism of Rome. Kant, on the other hand, is the philosopher of Protestantism. He furnishes the rational basis for the religious principles of the Reformers.

In his negotiations with the governments he was remarkably successful. Fifteen different governments have treated diplomatically with the Pope, and China and Japan are in friendly relations. He has restored the international prestige and dignity of the Papal See to a higher position than it has enjoyed for centuries. He has served as mediator between nations. He has spoken with authority on the great social questions and has been instrumental in bringing peace out of strife between the classes and the masses. His utterances on social problems will continue to be valuable literature on the subject. Yet as one reads the concordats and the results of the negotiations between the Curia and the Powers he is convinced that, almost without exception, the Church has gained a

vantage ground. As a diplomat Leo ranks among the greatest of Catholic Popes.

We may safely conclude that Leo XIII. was a great man, a brilliant scholar, a devout Christian and an ardent champion of papal ideals. We are convinced, however, that the system of ecclesiasticism for which he stood, does not represent the Christian ideal nor does it serve the highest interests of humanity. The papacy, dominated by Jesuitism, is not in harmony with the spiritual religion of Jesus Christ. Catholicism even, which we believe ought not to be identified with papal absolutism, is a medieval type of religion and life which cannot be reconciled with the modern spirit. Protestantism and Romanism are essentially antagonistic. For one party to yield to the other is to prove traitorous to its cause. Yet their attitude should be one of tolerance. Both sides must recognize the conscientious convictions by which the opponent is animated. It is no longer a battle with sword and stake and inquisition. The days of St. Bartholomew massacres, Smithfield fires, and the cruelties of Alva are past.

The conflict ought to be one of principles rather than prejudices. It is medievalism versus modernism, absolutism versus freedom, tradition versus independent research. There doubtless will be an outburst of human passion, Jesuitic intrigues in private homes and public councils, fanatical denunciations and stolid indifference. Yet these will not determine the issue. Neither Romanism nor Protestantism is the final form of Christianity. Both have their imperfections. The problems of religion could not be solved and the establishment of the Kingdom could not be effected by the return of Protestants to Rome, or by the conversion of Rome to Protestantism. Yet there is reasonable hope in the light of tendencies within Romanism itself, that forces are at work which will cast off the claims of the Vatican Council and renounce the ideals of the Jesuits. The light is breaking in on every side and no institution can stand in the way of historic progress without being eventually crushed under its wheels. There are forces

at work in Protestantism which are delivering it from the Romanism which remained in its bosom in spite of the Reformers. The principles of the 16th century of necessity carry their advocates beyond the 16th century. The price of Protestantism is continual reconstruction and progress in the light of the ever broader vision and larger life.

In his note on the Kaiser's letter on Babel and Bibel, Professor Harnack ventures a prophecy: " 'If ye love me, keep my commandments'; 'by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another'—it is more important to ponder on these words, and to order our lives in conformity with them, than to seek to press the inscrutable and venerable into formulas. And the time will come, is indeed at hand, when evangelical Christians will sincerely unite in acknowledging Jesus Christ as the Lord, and in resolving to carry out his teaching; and then our Catholic brethren must needs follow."

G. W. R.

## VIII.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

[Any books noticed in this REVIEW can be obtained, at the lowest prices, of the *Reformed Church Publication Board*, 1306 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.]

**PRACTICAL THEOLOGY: A NEGLECTED FIELD IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.**  
By Professor Gerald Birney Smith. Pages 21. 10 x 6 inches. Price 25 cents, net. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill. 1903.

It is the purpose of this little volume, according to its author, "to call attention to certain significant results of the introduction of scientific and historical methods into modern theological study. The specific question to be asked and answered is whether the divinity school which adopts the scientific method is performing its duty to the church for which it professes to train ministers. If it is not, what solution of the problem is compatible with the integrity of the scientific spirit in the curriculum"? As to the relation between the scientific spirit and the practical interests of the church the author makes the following admission: "It is impossible to ignore the fact that a certain lack of sympathy, amounting sometimes to distrust and even hostility, exists between modern theological scholarship and the evangelical interests of the church. The scholar feels that no greater disaster could befall Christianity than to continue to proclaim doctrines which can not be scientifically defended. He, therefore, is impatient at the indifference or hostility with which his critical investigations are greeted by the church. The preacher, on the other hand, knows that skepticism is fatal to faith. He, therefore, deplures even the honest questioning of the scholar because they introduce a negative tone where he desires positive conviction."

What is the solution of the problem here presented? How is the difficulty to be overcome? By abandoning the scientific method, some would say. That would be the solution of Romanism. Stick to the creed or the dogma laid down by the church. But would this be a solution? Would the intelligent men and women of the age accept it? We think not. The preaching of doctrines which are not tenable in the forum of the best modern thought would simply be laughed to scorn by a modern audience, however ignorant the preachers might be of any conflict between himself and the world in which he lives. The business of the preacher is to adapt and apply the truth of

God's revelation to the condition and wants of the age. Even the objective presentation of the thoughts of the sacred writers is not sufficient, because their intellectual and moral world was not our intellectual and moral world. The author of the booklet before us makes this clear by reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose thought must be translated into the categories and methods of the modern mental life in order that it may again possess the psychological value which it had for its original readers. So with other scriptures.

The author of this treatise makes various practical suggestions for meeting the difficulties under consideration. He thinks these difficulties must be met in the theological seminary; and that no little change is required here in order that the seminary may again answer the purpose of its existence. The department of practical theology especially needs to be largely reconstructed. As practical theology has come down to us from the past, it has had to do mainly with matters of *form*—the form of the sermon in homiletics, of visitation in pastoral theology—and scarcely any thing with the matter or content of ministerial activity. Consequently also but little time was assigned to the department of practical theology in the curriculum of the divinity school. As for the way in which all this should now be changed we would refer the reader to the treatise here under consideration, which will well reward his thoughtful perusal. We simply venture to offer one remark in conclusion. It must be admitted, we think, that the scientific method in theology, whether in exegesis, history, or dogmatics, may be so used as to weaken the spiritual power of the Christian minister. In Biblical and historical theology especially is this true. Critical and historical study with a view of reaching the *truth* rather than a *pretense* of it, implies for the time being a certain suspension of judgment; but this is *doubt*, and doubt can not be preached. This suggests that the preacher, or the practical theologian, must make a difference between *religion* and *theology*. The things which can be *doubted* are not of the essence of religion. For instance, to offer an example of the highest order, faith in Jesus as the Son of God and Saviour of the world, is an exercise of faith that is essential to the Christian religion; but this does not apply to any theory as to the manner of His conception and birth. As to that there may be uncertainty; but that uncertainty need not at all, indeed *must* not, interfere with the firmness and decision of preaching Christ as the wisdom of God, and the power of God unto salvation. As to this the preacher can have no doubt, no matter what his state of mind may be as to matters which may depend upon the explanation of a text. Such matters are at best only matters of probability; but *probability* is not of the



faith that will move the world. The certainty of a future life and judgment, for instance, must not be conditioned on any theory of Christ's second advent. But this subject is worthy of much further reflection, and we commend the treatise which forms the subject of this notice to the thoughtful attention of our readers.

W. R.

THE TEMPLE BIBLE.

OLD TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA:

MACCAREES I. AND II. Editor, W. Fairweather, M.A. Pages 188. 1903.

ECCLESIASTICUS. Editor, N. Schmidt, D.D., LL.D. Pages 179. 1903.

ESDRAS I. AND II. Editor, Archibald Duff, D.D., LL.D. Pages 146. 1903.

NEW TESTAMENT APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS. Editor, James Orr, D.D.

Pages 137. 1903.

Price per volume, 40 cents. Flexible cloth binding, gilt top. Lipincott & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

These volumes are arranged and executed on the same plan as are the volumes of the canonical scripture in this series. Each book is preceded by an introduction treating of the authorship, the time and place of composition, and the nature and arrangement of the contents. The text is that of the authorized English version; which is followed by a collection of explanatory notes intended to clear up any obscurities, or difficulties, arising out of the nature of the language, or out of the historical and geographical relations of the narratives recorded. Maps, tables, and other apparatus also are contained in the various volumes. With these helps the student can have no serious difficulty in understanding this portion of the writings connected with the history and character of our religion.

One need not, like the Roman Catholic Church, put the Apocrypha of the Old Testament on a level with the canonical scriptures, in order to prove their value to the Christian reader, and especially to the Christian minister and theologian. These writings date from the centuries immediately preceding the appearance of Christ, or some of them, from the very age of Christ and the Apostles. Some of them are perhaps contemporaneous as to time of origin with the latest of the canonical books of the Old Testament. The time between the composition of the last book of the Old Testament and the first of the New Testament was not a literary blank. The Jews during that period were not an inactive or dormant people. They were very much alive and very much awake. They accomplished great deeds, and thought great thoughts; and they wrote books which remained not without influence upon the development of religious thought in later ages. A number of the fundamental doctrines of the New Testament undoubtedly had their roots in the interval between canonical Judaism and the beginnings of Chris-

tianity. And these can be traced now in the Apocryphal writings which have come down to us from that age. Hence the Christian theologian who wants to know the truths of his religion can not afford to be indifferent to those writings. Christianity was not a new creation coming into the world abruptly, without any preparation for, or mediation, in the past religious life of the world. It was an evolution from Judaism, and in part also from the religious life and thought of the Greek people. The life and teaching of Jesus and of the Apostles presupposes a certain religious and moral condition of the people among whom they lived, and without that they could not have been what they were. If we could know, then, what Christ was and what He taught, we must know the people among whom He appeared; and no better helps to this end can be desired than the apocryphal writings which have come down to us from ages long past. Even a book so full of wild fancies and strange allegories as are the first and second Esdras, will show us what must have been the thoughts, the aspirations, the desires, and expectations of the Jewish people at the time when the Son of Man walked among them. "These two little pamphlets" says Dr. Duff in the introduction, "might well be called canonical and normative for him who wants to preach Christ. For to know them and their origin and their doctrine and their significance is to know the souls whom Jesus tried to heal and help, and to whose hunger for Christ and for a Saviour He cried, 'Come unto me.' It was to their agony over inborn sin and to their longing for a new heaven and a new earth that Paul and John preached. Here in Esdras I. and II. is canon for a teacher of Christianity." The same may be said of the books of the Maccabees, of Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach. As history and as ethics as well as religion they are indispensable to the Christian theologian. And this may be said of them without implying that they are in all respects equal to the canonical books of the Old Testament; although many theologians would doubtless be sorely puzzled if they were to be asked to define the difference. The Alexandrian Jews made no difference, while the Palestinensians did. The Ante-Nicene Christian Fathers argued from them in the same manner as from the canonical books of the Old Testament. The Greek and Roman Catholics, as well as the Lutheran Churches receive them as inspired scriptures; while according to the Anglican Church they may be read, for example, of life and instruction of manners, though not for the establishment of doctrine.

While so much may not be said for the apocryphal writings of the New Testament, yet for the history of doctrine and development of faith in the old Catholic Church they are of the

utmost value. They show how in some cases heterodoxy became orthodoxy, while in others orthodoxy became heterodoxy. They show, too, how some of the most profane superstitions, and corruptions, and abuses of the Catholic Church in the middle ages grew from seeds which were already germinating in the age of the martyrs. The so-called *Gospel of James*, *Protevangelium Jacobi*, better than any thing else shows the trend of faith among Catholics in the third and fourth centuries. Mariolatry is there in full swing. Mary did not only miraculously conceive and bring forth her son without ceasing to be a virgin, but was herself born immaculately, and as the mother of God was the chief object of worship for the faithful, while her divine son was deified in the heavens. With this notion of the birth of Jesus it was but a step to that wild notion of miracles which made the boy Jesus an unsafe companion and playmate among the boys of Nazareth. There is nothing of all this in our canonical Gospels. Jesus is a human infant and child like others. And, indeed, to feel the full weight of this truth one should read the Gospel of Thomas, with its wild stories about the infant Jesus on the way to Egypt bending down palm trees with their fruit, and taming wild beasts and fierce dragons. These stories are made accessible now, at a trifling expense, in these volumes of the *Temple Bible*, which contain the essential parts of the New Testament Apocrypha.

We think the J. P. Lippincott Company and their English cooperators have done well to include the Apocrypha in this series of the Temple Bible, for they will be wanted in the study of biblical questions which will be required of Christian theologians and ministers at no distant day in the future when the easy traditionalism of the past will no longer pass current among biblical scholars. We hope the publishers will find this enterprise of giving the church the Bible in so complete and convenient a form, eminently successful; and shall look for the appearance of the last volume at no distant day.

W. R.

**PRINCIPLES AND IDEALS FOR THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL, *An Essay in Religious Pedagogy.*** By Ernest DeWitt Burton and Shailer Mathews, professors in the University of Chicago. Pages 207. Price \$1.10. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill. 1903.

The Sunday-school, though an institution of modern times, has been well-nigh universally accepted in European and American Christendom. The conception and ideal of it are, however, in many quarters still crude. If one listens to the addresses delivered at Sunday-school conventions and other ecclesiastical meetings he may soon be convinced that in many quarters at

least, there is a lamentable lack of sound knowledge as to what the Sunday-school really is, and what it is intended to accomplish in modern Protestant Christianity. Various books and treatises have been written on the subject, all of which are of more or less value, though most of them are marred by fanciful or extravagant notions. A very common mistake in such publications is to magnify the institution beyond its proper conception and value. Thus in so good a volume as H. Clay Trumbull's "Yale Lectures on the Sunday-school" we are told in all seriousness that Abraham was a Sunday-school teacher who gathered together his servants on Sabbath afternoons and taught them the Bible. Similar slips occur elsewhere throughout that work.

Of such defects this volume of Professor Burton and Matthews is entirely free. It contains a great deal of information for the use of Sunday-school superintendents, officers, and teachers that should tend to make the institution more valuable than it has been in the past; and there is in it little that any minister or member of the Reformed Church could reasonably object to. What is said of the nature and aim of the Sunday-school, of its relation to the Church, of its general management, of the subject-matter and methods of teaching, can generally be endorsed without any qualification.

The book is divided into two parts, the first part treating of *The Teacher*, the second of *The School*. The first part begins with a discussion of the purpose of the Sunday-school. That purpose is religious and moral education or culture, the development of Christian character in the pupils. This conception controls what is said of the qualifications and duties of the teacher, of his self-preparation, of his relation to his class, and similar matters. The teacher must himself be a student, he must be interested in his work. The subject-matter of Sunday-school teaching, as of preaching, is divine revelation, the word of God, and the source of it is the Bible. Teaching consists in the interpretation of the Bible, and the application of its truth to the minds and hearts of the scholars, with a view to the development of Christian character. This idea of the production of Christian character as the aim of Sunday-school activity, and, indeed, of all church activity, is peculiar to this book, and runs through all its pages. It has certain presuppositions which should be well understood. One of these is the capacity for Christian development on the part of Sunday-school pupils. They are not by nature totally depraved and laboring under the condemnation and curse of God. We hear nothing in this book of the "salvation of the soul." The souls of young people possess the capacity of growing gradually into Christian personalities. Whether this capacity belongs to them by nature, or

whether it is the product of "sacramental grace" the writers of this volume do not tell us, although there is no occasion to be ignorant of what they themselves believe. They hold no theory of magical regeneration or transformation of human nature. But even those who do hold such a theory should not object to the conception of a gradual development of Christian character under the influence of divine grace and truth as displayed in the offices of the Christian church. This at least is a view that is well known among us, and we should be glad to see it held by professors in a great Baptist university.

The section on the *basis of authority in teaching* is supremely interesting, but we can scarcely do more than simply refer to it. The teacher's authority, like that of the preacher, is not the church expressing itself in creed and dogma. On the contrary it is the Bible; but the Bible as interpreted. And what is the authority in the work of interpretation? It is the truth itself—the word of God. That is a conclusion with which we are not unfamiliar, and to which no Protestant Christian can properly object. There can be no middle ground between this view and Romanism. As to the method of teaching recommended in this book there can be but one view, but we have not space to dwell upon it. We would only say that we thoroughly agree with the view of our authors in opposition to what is called "the preaching method" of Sunday-school teaching, which consists in application and exhortation without much regard to the interpretation and meaning of a passage of scripture supposed to be studied. Application is necessary in order to make Scripture profitable for instruction in righteousness, but it must be the application of the *truth* ascertained by means of a sound method of interpretation. Real teaching, like real preaching, must include interpretation as well as application.

Part second of the book before us treats of *The School*—its grading, the construction of a graded curriculum, organization of the graded school, the library, benevolence in the school, the function of a Sunday-school ritual. Of course, the modern Sunday-school, like the modern public or week-day school, needs to be graded in order that it may properly answer its purpose. The lessons to be taught and the method of teaching them must be adapted to the age and capacity of those who are to be taught. According to the authors of this book a graded curriculum would require nineteen years for its completion. They take for their example of classification that of the modern highschool and college. This seems to us excessive. It must be remembered that the number of young people who go through highschool and college is but a very small minority of those who are to be educated; and that, if the highschool and college curriculum

were to be made to apply to all alike, it would be a hinderance rather than a help to their education. Is it not so also in the case of the Sunday-school? The number of young people who can attend Sunday-school for nineteen years of their life must be very small indeed. Is it well, then, to adopt such an extended curriculum for the Sunday-school? As an ideal it may be; but it must be borne in mind that in few cases only will such an ideal be practicable. Hence in actual Sunday-schools it will be better that the ideal should be consciously modified with a view of meeting existing conditions. Classification of a school is necessary, but it must be kept within bounds.

And now how are the lessons, to be studied, to be adapted to the different classes in the school? Are the lessons to be uniform throughout the school, so that the same lessons are studied by all the scholars of the same school, and by all the schools in the country, on the same day, and shall the adaptation to scholars of different ages and capacities consist only in some modification in the *method* of teaching? Or shall the adaptation consist in the *matter* as well as *method*? The first is the idea of the International Sunday-school Committee, and is realized in the International lessons; the latter is the idea of the authors of the book under consideration. They think and speak strongly on this subject, without, however, naming the International Committee and their work. And we wish that all our readers and many more would read this book. The International system has some merits. First, it is a system; secondly, it facilitates the production of cheap literature. These are advantages. But it is the worst of all systems, because its division of the Biblical material is simply mechanical and mathematical, and not vital and organic. It violates the principles of the church year, which is dear to some churches; but what is worse than that is that it violates the principle of the Bible itself. Its working principle is the idea of getting over the Bible once in seven years without any regard to its contents, as if all parts of the Bible were precisely equal in instructive and edifying power. But here we must bring this notice to a close. We commend this book to our readers. We have for years objected to the International lesson-series, and we are glad to meet such strong support now from so eminent a source.

W. R.

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY. By Martin Luther. Translated into English by A. C. Buchheim, Ph.D. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa. Pages 56. Price 10 cents. Paper binding.

This pamphlet contains one of the three great reformation writings of Martin Luther. Its companion works are the Appeal



to the German Nobility and the Babylonish Captivity of the Church. These three "Primary Works" or "The First Principles of the Reformation" were published in the year 1520. They represent the spirit of the German Reformer in the freshness and vigor of young manhood, becoming conscious of the great difference between salvation in Christ Jesus as he experienced it in his monastic struggles and as it was taught by the Roman Church of which he was after all a child. To appreciate the movement from 1517 to 1521 one must read these three writings which have been published for some time in an excellent English translation by Wace and Buchheim. The last of these is now offered under separate cover to the general reader in a convenient and cheap form. Dr. Schaff says: "The beautiful tract on 'Christian Freedom' is a pearl among Luther's writings. This Irenicon must meet the approval of every true Christian, whether Catholic or Protestant. It breathes the spirit of a genuine disciple of St. Paul. It is full of heroic faith and child-like simplicity."

G. W. R.

**HISTORICAL AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES IN LITERATURE RELATED TO THE NEW TESTAMENT**, issued under the direction of the Department of Biblical and Patristic Greek. Second Series. Linguistic and Exegetical Studies. Volume 1, Part 1. *The Virgin Birth* by Allan Hoben, Ph.D. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1903. Pages 85. Price 50 cents. Paper bound.

The author states his purpose in the preface. "This work is purely an historical essay. Taking the story of the Virgin Birth as found in the New Testament, it aims to trace the history of its interpretation and use throughout the Ante-Nicene period." He does not attempt to discuss the bearing of his conclusions on the doctrines of the Church relative to this subject. It is a timely study, for no question is claiming the attention of theologians more and is calling forth the suspicions of the laity more than the virgin birth and its allied doctrines. Yet no one can approach the subject intelligently excepting by a critical and historical study of the meaning of the original accounts and the use that has been made of these records by the Fathers of the Church. Dr. Hoben has rendered the Church valuable service by his critical, impartial, and original study of this question in the light of the sources of the first three centuries. His conclusions will aid scholars in a proper estimate of the significance of the story of the virgin birth in the history of doctrine and in systems of dogmatics. Every interested student should read this essay and follow the numerous quotations and references given by the author to substantiate his inferences. Since the subject is one of vital importance we shall at some



length state the stages in the development of the doctrine and the deductions which may be drawn from the process.

Whence do Matthew and Luke get their accounts of the birth of the Christ? Resch holds that both evangelists used "a pre-canonical child history, which had been translated from Hebrew into Greek, and that, if we had that history, it would be a harmony of the infancy stories of the first and third gospels." Conrady regards the *protevangelium* of James as that pre-canonical source used by both Matthew and Luke. The author differs from these authorities and states his conclusion, after close critical comparison of all his sources, thus: "Where the virgin birth story first appears it is attested by two witnesses which betray no certain sign of dependence of one upon the other or of both upon a common source." Accordingly the story did not come down through a single tradition but was probably known to Christians generally some time before the accounts in the first and third gospels were written." Yet it is quite certain that no use was made of this story, for doctrinal or devotional purposes, prior to the time of Ignatius in the second decade of the second century. "The narrative of the virgin birth, if in existence, made no impression upon the exponents of Christianity prior to the formation and crystallization of the preaching gospel, or indeed, within the period in which the New Testament books—most of them, at least—arose. There is no trace of it in Peter's preaching, as preserved to us; and Paul, though it would seem that he could have made occasional good use of the teaching, preserves a significant silence; Matthew's gospel, from 8: 1 on, depending upon Mark, is also silent; and that portion of the gospel of Luke which, as we judge from 1: 2 and Acts 1: 21, 22, constituted for him the gospel proper, viz., that which began, like Mark, with the public ministry of Jesus as inaugurated by John the Baptist, is likewise destitute of any trace of the virgin-birth story. The Gospel of John is also silent." These omissions and silences in the Scripture of the first century are indeed significant and should be carefully weighed by students on this subject.

Before we proceed to inquire into the use made of the virgin birth in the Ante-Nicene Fathers we should try to discover the meaning of the story in the evangelists. According to Matthew Jesus was conceived without the aid of a human agent by the wonder-working Spirit of God. Such a conception and birth were in accord with the Immanuel prophecy in *Isai.*, chapters 7 and 8. The name Immanuel had a prophetic and symbolic meaning. It designated the messianic work of the child, which was to "save His people from their sins." The nation's sins were their withdrawal from God. The Messiah would lead

them back to God and keep them from future apostasy. Hence he was their Savior. As such he would deliver them from the consequence of their sins, namely, their subjection to foreign world powers. In no way does Matthew connect the nature of Jesus with his miraculous conception or virgin birth. The term Immanuel was not used to designate the divine nature, though it came to be so used in the patristic literature. Luke, also, implies the miraculous conception. The fact, however, that Jesus had no human father is not used to prove his divine nature. From the Angel's reply to Mary's question in 1: 34 we learn that because she was overshadowed by the power of the Highest, that which was begotten of her shall be called "holy." Through a human father, who would have to be a sinful descendant of Adam, the offspring would be polluted. By virtue of a conception by the Holy Spirit sin would be obviated and the child would be holy. Another result of the immediate activity of God on the Virgin was that he should be called "Son of God." This title may refer to his messianic work or to his moral likeness to God. The term is used in both senses in the Gospels.

In the two records of His birth there is no explanation of the divine nature of Jesus on the basis of His divine parentage. In neither of them is there the representation of an incarnation of a preëxistent divine being, such as is set forth in the prologue of John. We find only a statement and partial explanation of His purity and a prophecy of His greatness as the theocratic representative, both of which ideas are based on His supernatural conception. The church, however, has used these stories as proof-texts for many more doctrines on the person and nature of Christ. Let us see how these new interpretations arose in the Ante-Nicene period.

The first mention of the miraculous generation is found in the writings of Ignatius, who died a martyr between 107 and 117 A. D. He does not formulate a doctrine, but throughout his letters makes statements in regard to the virgin birth which enable us to understand his views. "It is very clear that Ignatius makes the dual parentage the basis of the dual nature of Jesus; and it is almost as clear that he predicates preëxistence for the divine element in the nature of Jesus." His interpretation is already more complex, though still unphilosophical, than that of Matthew and Luke. He goes beyond these in affirming the dual nature on the basis of the miraculous conception. He was apparently influenced in his interpretation by John's prologue or teaching similar to that. He, also, gives evidence of apologetic and polemic interest for he refers to those who would say aught against the peculiar manner of Jesus' birth.

In Justin Martyr we have a definite advance beyond the doctrines of the Gospel and Ignatius. He states the fact that in his time there were Christians, in good standing among their brethren, who denied the miraculous birth. Yet Justin himself does not agree with them. His idea of Jesus' birth was that of an incarnation. He tries to reconcile the prologue of John and the account in Luke. The "Spirit" and "Power," mentioned in the latter, he identifies with the "Word" in the former. Thus when the Spirit came upon Mary and the Power of the highest overshadowed her, the "Word" came into her and the incarnation was effected. He, also, shows acquaintance with an extra-canonical source but there are no traces of influence on his views from this direction.

With Irenæus (120-202 A. D.) we begin the period of polemics. Teachers were arising in the Church who denied the real divinity of Christ and others who denied the real humanity. While Justin could tolerate those who believed in the natural generation of Jesus, the miraculous conception was now weighted with so many theological consequences that it could not be denied with impunity. He "makes the virgin birth a basal and essential factor in constituting Jesus a fit and capable Savior for lost and polluted man, hence those who do not believe in the virgin birth are 'in the bondage of the old obedience' and 'in a state of death.' " He is one of the first to imply that the acceptance of this doctrine is necessary for Salvation. He has, also, passed beyond the idea of a real birth, without the slightest intimation of preëxistence, such as the accounts in Matthew and Luke imply, and according to the fourth gospel makes it altogether an advent or an incarnation. He bases the divine Sonship and nature of Jesus on the fact that God, and not man, was His father. He takes a significant step beyond the earlier apologists in affirming that the preëminence of Jesus and His unique moral worth were dependent upon the virgin birth. The former considered His moral character and not the manner of His birth the proof of His Messiahship and His divine Sonship.

In the leading Fathers of the third century, Tertullian, Clement and Origen, we find some marked changes and advances in the interpretation of the birth. The apocryphal gospels are more and more recognized as a source along side of the canonical records. Tertullian was influenced by them in his views on the perpetual virginity of Mary. Both Clement and Origen refer to extra canonical sources and betray a reliance on them for certain views. The theory of a preëxistent being, becoming incarnate, gradually supplants the idea of the generation of a new being. Tertullian still holds both views and mediates between them. Origen clearly states his belief in the preëxistence of

Christ as the Word. He believed in the miraculous conception and real birth but exalted the whole matter above the rightful field for man's investigation. A new interpretation of the virgin birth was given by Tertullian who began to use it as a proof for the *humanity* of Jesus. This became necessary because of the docetic views which were taught by the Gnostics. Origen's chief addition to the previous doctrines was the chastity of Mary as emphasized in the teaching of her perpetual virginity in the Apocryphal Gospels.

Omitting a number of the Fathers, who discuss the virgin birth at the close of the third century, we come to the last of the Ante-Nicene period, Alexander of Alexandria (died about 326). In him we have the influence of the three sources which were now used by all writers on the subject, viz., the canonical infancy stories, the Logos teaching of John, and the Apocryphal literature. "He states how God the Son, whose creation was beyond the human mind to grasp and who reigned with the Father in Heaven, descended to earth and became incarnate in the Virgin's womb, assuming from her, who was thus constituted the Mother of God, an actual body. Alexander was heir of the whole process of the development of this doctrine in the centuries preceding, by which the child born of Mary was made to be the Messiah, divine, and preëxistent. At the same time Mary was exalted from her obscurity as virgin to "ever virgin," and from "ever virgin" to "all holy," and from "all holy" to what was inevitable in the trinitarian thought—"mother of God."

When we take a retrospect of the development of the doctrine of the virgin birth we observe several significant facts. First, the infancy narrative was the *first source* and the only one, from which material concerning the virgin birth was drawn. In Ignatius we have evidence of a *second source*, the prologue of John or views similar to the prologue. In the writings of Tertullian and Origen the Apocryphal gospels are recognized as a *third source* and begin to shape phases of doctrine. The doctrine of the church, as it comes down to us, is based on these three distinct sources.

Second, the original significance of the miraculous conception and virgin birth was that the child born of Mary was the Messiah, referring to His office and work, and that He was holy or pure, referring to His character. The *narratives of Matthew and Luke do not refer to His preëxistence nor to His dual nature*. These views come later in the church. The next stage was to unite the infancy narrative with the prologue of John. Therefore, an effort is made to show how the conception and birth of Jesus were also the incarnation of the Logos. Henceforth the incarnation theory prevails over that of the generation of a new

creature, implied in Matthew and Luke. In the latter half of the second century the *divinity* of Jesus is deduced from His miraculous conception. This was done in opposition to the Ebionitic views, which made Jesus a mere man. A little later the *humanity* of Jesus was based on His virgin birth, in answer to the Docetists, who denied that Jesus was a real man. It was considered necessary to accept the doctrine of the miraculous conception in order to be saved. That is, it became an article of saving faith. The virgin birth thus was made the basis of His mediatorship, of His sinlessness, and His ability to save a lost race. This is the view which prevails in Catholicism and Protestantism to-day. On this account men throw up their hands in horror when the corner stone of the faith is touched. If the conclusions of the fathers of the first three centuries are valid, if they properly interpreted and used the infancy stories, the Logos doctrine, and the Apocryphal gospels, then we have reason to tremble for the ark, if their conclusions are changed. Yet no unbiased student can read the history of this doctrine without feeling that many extra-biblical, if not unbiblical, elements were added to it by the Fathers. If the *Bible only* is our rule of faith we should confine ourselves to the biblical narratives, and not stamp with biblical authority the doctrines and imaginations of men who were further removed in spirit from original Apostolic Christianity than we are. The Church was a century old before it began to lay any stress in its preaching and its teaching on the infancy narratives. It passed, in that time, through its most prosperous period. Men lived the Christ life without a knowledge of the minutely wrought out dogmas which the Church holds as the essence of the faith to-day. May we not conserve that life when the clear facts of history compel the church to reinterpret some of the traditional doctrines. Scholars will find it more and more difficult to find the material for fourth century dogmas in the gospels and epistles of the New Testament. But if we make the *Bible and tradition or the Fathers* our norm of faith then we may accept the first four centuries as our infallible guide for faith and practice, and congratulate ourselves that the Fathers have done our thinking for us and we, their sons, may remain at ease in Zion forever.

G. W. R.

**THE STORY OF THE CHURCHES.**

**THE BAPTISTS.** By Henry E. Vedder, D.D., Professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary. Pages 245. Price \$1.00.

**THE PRESBYTERIANS.** By Charles Lemuel Thompson, D.D., Secretary of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Pages 312. Price \$1.00.

The Baker & Taylor Co., 33-37 East Seventeenth St., Union Sq., North, N. Y.

The aim of "The Story of the Churches" is to present the

history of American Churches in a simple and popular form. A volume is devoted to each of the leading denominations. It is composed by an authoritative historian of the several denominations. The series is less pretentious than the American Church History published in thirteen volumes some years ago. That was more for the theologian and the preacher; this is more for the layman, though by no means unprofitable reading for the preacher who has not the time nor the patience to read more elaborate works.

The Story of the Baptists was written by Dr. Vedder, of Crozer Theological Seminary. He is a recognized authority on American church history and specialist in Baptist history. His style is clear and vigorous. He has the power of expressing his ideas in an attractive and brief form. The contents is divided into seven chapters with the following headings: Who and What are the Baptists? The Historical Antecedents of the Baptists; The Beginnings of Baptist Churches; Baptists in Great Britain and her Dependencies; Baptist Beginnings in America; Baptists in the United States; Baptist Missions.

His definition and analysis of Baptist principles in the first chapter is worthy of careful study. In a short space he outlines the fundamental positions of this great movement, which are so utterly misunderstood by the other churches. The Baptists stand for certain distinctive ideas in Protestantism, which had their origin among the contemporaries of Luther and Zwingli. The Baptist spirit, though not, indeed, the Baptist Church, may be traced back to the first century. The author does not attempt to find any direct connection between modern Baptist and medieval sects but calls the Mennonites their immediate spiritual ancestors. He follows the Mennonite movement on the continent and shows how it came into England through English settlers in the Netherlands.

Among the early Puritan settlers of New England there were a number who held Baptist principles, some of whom afterwards became Baptists, but there were not enough at any one time or place to form a church. The first Baptist Church was founded by Roger Williams in Providence, Rhode Island. He had been a congregationalist in spirit but by his study of the scriptures concluded that infant baptism had no biblical warrant. Others in the community reached the same conclusion. Since there was no minister other than Williams among them they were compelled to originate baptism among themselves. Accordingly Ezekiel Holliman baptized Williams, and he baptized Holliman and ten others. Thus the First Baptist Church of Providence, with twelve members, was established in the year 1639. The rapid growth of the Church in this country and Great Britain in spite



of adverse circumstances should awaken our interest in its history. To-day Baptists stand second numerically among the Protestant Churches of the United States. They have large institutions of learning, extensive missionary operations, men of national influence; all of which leads us to ask wherein lies the secret of Baptist success. We can answer that question only in the light of its fundamental principles and its history, as these are set forth in the volume by Dr. Vedder.

Dr. Thompson devotes his first chapter to "Presbyterian Origins" in which the characteristically presbyterian principles are traced to their source in Geneva under Calvin. They were taken up by the Reformers of Holland, France, Scotland and England. They came to the United States by way of Southampton, Delfthaven, Londonderry and Havre. He includes among the Presbyterian elements in our national life the Scotch, Scotch-Irish, English, French Huguenots, and the Dutch. "It is thus apparent that Presbyterianism in this country is the resultant of national forces, diverse in their character and yet one in their great moulding principles."

The rise and spread of the Church in the United States is rapidly and concisely sketched. The author, being Secretary of the Board of Home Missions, has an eye for the Missionary activity in the Church. One follows the early pioneers in the south and west with intense interest and is impressed by the effort of the church to keep abreast with the growing population. Puritanism must be considered one of the chief formative factors in the religious and moral life of the colonial and constitutional periods. The early settlements in New England were largely Calvinistic in theology and divided as to polity between Independents and Presbyterians. Later the Scotch-Irish settled in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In Virginia and North Carolina they were an aggressive element. In the former state they struggled for their rights against the claims and aggressions of the Church of England. In the latter state the Scotch-Irish of Mecklenburg County, in May, 1775, issued the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, which may be called a forerunner of the Philadelphia Declaration. When the lands beyond the Alleghanies were occupied by the pioneers, the Presbyterians sent their missionaries, built churches and opened schools. The Spirit of missions manifested itself in the early preachers. Puritanism stood for reform and for missions. John Eliot was "the Apostle to the Indians." Francis Doughty, whom Dr. Briggs calls "the Apostle of Presbyterianism in America," went about preaching to little flocks which became Presbyterian Churches. Driven from one place to another by intolerance, he labored in New York City, Long Island, and Maryland. Francis Makemie



laid the foundations of organized Presbyterianism. "Resolute, grave, self-sacrificing, and utterly devoted to giving the gospel to as many communities as he could reach—he journeyed in restless and perilous adventure from the Carolinas to New York, gathering together 'the poor desolate people' wherever opportunity offered and preaching to them with the zeal of an apostle the gospel which came to many in their isolation like a strain of half-forgotten music."

But the Presbyterians were, also, a scholarly church. They laid stress on Orthodoxy and the doctrinal forms of Christianity. Consequently in their American history they have been shaken and rent by bitter theological controversies. A division arose in 1741 between the Old Lights and the New Lights. It was a conflict between Puritanism and Methodism in principle. The political questions, or the relation of the Church to the American Government, was another source of strife in the different churches. In the third decade of the last century came an era of theological changes which ended in heresy trials and divisions. The volume closes with a full account of the last doctrinal controversies and confessional changes precipitated by Briggs and others.

The reading of such a history will cultivate intelligent denominational loyalty in the members of that particular church and, also, throw light on the history of other churches who have gone through similar struggles. Thus it serves to awaken a sense of union between denominations and bring about that Christian tolerance which is so essential for the success of Christianity in our country.

G. W. R.

**HAVE WE THE LIKENESS OF CHRIST?** By Franklin Johnson, Professor of Church History and Homiletics. Reprint from the University of Chicago Decennial Publications, First Series, Vol. III., Part I., 24 pp., 4to, paper; net, 50 cents; postpaid, 54 cents. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

**THE ELEMENTS OF CHRYSOSTOM'S POWER AS A PREACHER.** By Galusha Anderson. Reprint from the University of Chicago Decennial Publications, Vol. III., Part I., 16 pp., 4to, paper; net, 25 cents; postpaid, 27 cents. University of Chicago Press, Illinois.

One of the difficult questions for archeologists and artists to answer has been in reference to the likeness of Christ. Have we the likeness of Christ? Until lately scholars have usually concluded that we do not. This answer was based chiefly on literary evidence. Garucci, in his history of Christian art in six folio volumes, "answers the question by an appeal to Augustine, who says that in his time no one knew what the personal appearance of Christ was." Another line of evidence, derived from art itself, has been gathered in a volume, entitled *Rex Regnum*, by Sir Wyke Bayliss, a distinguished painter, and

president of the Royal Society of British artists. He selects, from the representation of Christ in the mosaics of the older churches of Rome, five specimens which conform most nearly to his ideal. He then selects six or seven frescoes from the Roman Catacombs and four gildings on glass, the frescoes and gildings resembling the mosaics. The elements, which are common in these typical pictures of Christ, are supposed to represent a tradition which goes back to the Apostolic age and comes probably from a contemporary of Jesus. This conclusion, in regard to an Apostolic tradition of a Christ likeness, on the basis of the above named types, Professor Johnson calls into question. He takes up the arguments of Sir Wyke in detail and refutes them by archeological and artistic evidence. The reader is aided in following the discussion by sixteen half-tone illustrations, representing the mosaics, frescoes and gildings upon which the original study by Bayliss is based.

The author concludes his essay as follows: "I have not proved that the likeness of Christ does not exist. Nor have I proved that it can never be recovered and identified. I have only proved that the testimony of early Christian art, in so far as we have yet been able to secure it, agrees with that of early Christian literature in answering our questions in the negative."

To the general reader Dr. Johnson's points against Bayliss are well made and convincing. He shows a thorough knowledge of the sources and is certainly capable of meeting with his own weapons the distinguished president of the Royal Society of British Artists.

A more practical study is that by Professor Anderson on "The Elements of Chrysostom's Power as a Preacher." It is a study based on the works of Chrysostom and records concerning him by ancient historians. A brief account of his parentage and early training is given. Reference is made to his studies preparatory to the practice of law and then to his conversion through the influence of his friend Basil.

The specific elements which rendered him worthy of the name Chrysostom, "mouth of gold," among the Greek Fathers were his thorough preparation according to the intellectual and spiritual standards of the age, his style both in the composition and delivery of his sermons, his fidelity to his calling, his ethical and practical sermons, his tenderness and sympathy. All of these elements were made effective by his stainless character.

The constant study of the great preachers of the ages according to the method of this essay will be of untold benefit to the present day pastor. The reading of sermons does not suffice; much less the purchasing of homiletic works and sermon outlines. But the mastery of a few great personalities, in the light of their

age and their compositions, is the surest way of becoming imbued with their spirit rather than being mere imitators or copyists of their style and their substance. G. W. R.

THIRSTING FOR THE SPRINGS. By J. H. Jowett, M.A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. Pages 208. Price \$1.25.

We have in a previous number spoken of a volume by Mr. Jowett, entitled, *Brooks by the Traveller's Way*. The volume before us, entitled, *Thirsting for the Springs*, is a continuation of the sermonettes in the preceding series. They are brief practical expositions of scripture passages and by their simple style, apt illustrations, and wealth of Christian experience are bound to appeal to the hearer or reader. The author is the successor of Dr. Dale in the pulpit of Carrs Lane, Birmingham, England. Although he is the follower of a line of leading English preachers, who occupied that pulpit for the last century, he has kept up interest and continues to attract the people. This book contains twenty-six addresses about ten minutes in length on a variety of subjects. As an aid for the preparation for mid-week services and as means of suggesting fresh lines of thought on well-known texts, it will be a valuable addition to the preacher's library. But the principal purpose of this publication is to stimulate the religious life in the reader as the spoken addresses edified those who first heard them. G. W. R.

THE SPIRIT IN MAN. SERMONS AND SELECTIONS. By Horace Bushnell. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 153-157 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Pages 473. Price \$1.25, net.

Horace Bushnell was born in 1802 and died in 1876. In commemoration of the centennial of his birth a new revised edition of his works has been published. That such a publication should be demanded by the public thirty years after his death, and that it should be undertaken by the publishers as a safe business venture is proof of the influence of Dr. Bushnell on the life and thought of the last century. He not only lived in his age but beyond it. Many of his doctrines were received with suspicion and even condemnation when they were first announced. He shared the fate of a theological pioneer. But he is, also, reaping his reward. He was the first New Englander who broke away from traditional Arminianism and Calvinism. The controversies between the representatives of these two parties had a baneful effect on healthy piety and on normal Christianity. Genius as he was, Bushnell interpreted Christianity from a new standpoint, gave it new forms of expression, and cast it in terms of life rather than of doctrine. Dr. Stevens in the *REVIEW* of July writes: "Bushnell saw all things, if I may so express it, with the homiletic eye; what he sought was a preachable theology.

\* \* \* Bushnell's thought has been a pervasive leaven in the religious thinking and life of the English-speaking world. His sermons have been widely read and no sermons thus far published are so likely to attain immortality. \* \* \* And, yet, his theological and controversial writings ought to be more widely read. They are still full of life and fire. They are works of genius—they belong to the 'literature of power,' such books as 'God in Christ,' 'Christ in Theology,' 'Natural and the Supernatural,' and 'Vicarious Sacrifice.'"

In the light of such an appreciation by a scholar of this generation we can estimate all the better the value of a volume from Dr. Bushnell. The title of this volume is taken from one of his sermons published in the "Sermons for the New Life." It covers the scope of subjects treated. The contents is divided into four parts. Part one contains an essay on Inspiration by the Holy Spirit; part two, a series of eleven sermons; part three, selections from sermons on twenty-eight different topics; part four, miscellanies—A Marriage Ceremony, A Group of Letters, Selected Aphorisms from his Writings, Bibliography.

The sermons and essays of this volume were never published before. They have been selected from papers left in the care of his wife and after thirty years have been prepared for publication by Mary Bushnell Cheney. An examination of the subjects of the sermons shows the character of the thought which has pervaded the English-speaking world. He did not deal with trivialities, and outlandish themes. He discussed religion. He ministered to the deepest needs of the soul. He dealt with eternal principles in a manly way and, therefore, while dead he still speaketh. He spoke on subjects like the following: Christ the Form of the Soul, God's Thoughts Fit Bread for Children, A Great Life begins Early, The Finite Demands the Infinite. His texts are from unexplored parts of the Bible and would not suggest to the average reader the great themes he found in them. He was imbued with the word of God and he saw His glory shine out of every page. While no one could well repeat those sermons to-day lest he would be a David in Saul's armor, their contents should be absorbed and turned into our own spirit and life. A few such books mastered would do far more toward the making of a man and a preacher than the cursory reading of many papers, periodicals and romances. Robertson in England, Bushnell and Brooks in America, should be life-long companions of the preacher of to-day.

G. W. R.

**ERROMANGA THE MARTYR ISLE.** By the Rev. H. A. Robertson, Erromanga. Pages 467. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1902.

This book gives a good description of the daily life of a mis-

sionary, as well as of the difficulties with which he must contend. Besides this, however, the book is interesting from a sociological standpoint. Not only does it bring before one the habits and customs of a primitive people, but it also shows—and this is perhaps its principal merit—the effects of civilization when introduced into a comparatively small savage community.

Erromanga, here called the Martyr Isle, is one of the islands of the New Hebrides group, and is about one thousand miles east of Australia. Its greatest length is thirty-five miles, and its greatest breadth twenty-five miles. The inhabitants are, for the most part, Melanesians, that is, black men who are ultimately of the same race as the Papuans of New Guinea, and the native Australians. The island first emerges into the clear light of history in 1839, when John Williams and a companion, who attempted to land there as missionaries, were instantly killed and afterwards eaten by the natives. Even before this, however, traders had visited the island to secure sandalwood. In the twenty or thirty years following the death of Williams sandalwood, to the value of a million or more dollars, was taken from the island. In 1857 Rev. George Gordon and his wife came to Erromanga. At first they were favorably received and remained four years among the people, teaching them. At the end of that time, however, a plague of measles began to rage on the island. As the missionaries were deemed responsible for the coming of this plague, they were cruelly murdered by the savages. The next missionary to the island was the Rev. James Gordon, a brother of the murdered Gordon, who arrived there in 1864. After a short time the Rev. Macnair and his wife also came, but in the course of a few years Rev. Macnair died, and Mrs. Macnair thereupon left the island. For a while the labors of Rev. Gordon were very successful. A school was established and the translation of the New Testament into Erromangese was well under way. At length, however, difficulties arose, the heathen became jealous of the spread of Christianity, and, finally, March 7, 1872, Rev. Gordon, like his brother, fell under the hand of a murderer.

In the meantime Rev. Robertson, the author of this book, had been preparing himself in Canada to take up missionary work in the New Hebrides. He and his newly married wife had already sailed for the field of their labors. When they landed at one of the smaller islands of the group, they learned of the tragic death of James Gordon on Erromanga. They at once decided to take his place, and in June, 1872, they began their work. Since then, with the exception of a short visit to Canada, they have labored continuously on the island, and almost all the natives have been led to give up their heathen ways. The savage

combats and cannibal feasts are now only a memory. The blood of the martyrs has been the seed of the church. Where once there were crowds of heathen naked, filthy, treacherous, their only implements being implements of war, now there are civilized men and women clothed, cleansed, trained to love one another, and accustomed to use the implements of productive industry.

The author cites many events in the history of Erromanga which deserves special attention because of the light which they shed upon society in general. The story of the early trade in sandalwood is a dark one. The natives were continuously cheated and sometimes murdered in scores by the heartless traders. On the other hand, the natives, when they had the opportunity, took bloody vengeance on all outsiders. In fact, it was partially to avenge injuries, which they had received a short time before from traders, that John Williams and his companion were killed by the savages. The history of this trade in sandalwood has its parallel in that of the African slave trade or in the story of our dealings with the Indians or, in fact, wherever a civilized race has attempted to carry on commerce with a savage one.

In viewing the history of this island—this little world one might say—as it is portrayed in the book we are considering, there are many things which make one glad, but many things also which make one sorry. If Christ bears a crown, he beareth also a sword. There were over six thousand people on the island when Christianity and civilization were first introduced. Now there are less than fifteen hundred and even this small number is rapidly decreasing. The strain of modern civilization is too great for the minds and bodies of savage tribes; especially where this civilization comes upon them comparatively suddenly, and they have not the protection of vast multitudes of people in the same condition as themselves. No wonder the savages of Erromanga opposed Christianity so bitterly; for, while it meant spiritual life, it meant also, to an extent, physical death. One may say that the flames of Christ have swept across the island. The dross has been consumed, but many noble characters have been made manifest. In general, however, it must be confessed that, even amongst the best of native Christians, one does not, as a rule discover that energy and force of character which we ordinarily associate with our conception of a Christian. Of all the natives that are brought before us in the book there is only one, Yomot, who really impresses us as possessing a full-rounded, Christian character. The rest, while often gentle and industrious, are, for the most part, merely hewers of wood and drawers of water.

The book is written in good style. The author wisely does



not trench upon questions of theology, but confines himself to the facts which have come under his observation. The description of the island—its natural features, climate, productions, and earthquakes—is strong, and brings the whole island clearly before one's imagination. The description of the heathen Erromangans and their customs is also good, and is of especial value for the sociologist. Of interest to the philologist is the fact that in the appendix the Lord's prayer is given in eighteen different dialects. Altogether, the book adds distinctively to our store of knowledge, and will be especially useful to those who desire at some time to enter upon mission work.

F. W. S.

**A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS IN THE REVISED VERSION WITH NEW HELPS FOR HISTORICAL STUDY.** By John A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D. Revised by Archibald Thomas Robertson, Professor of Interpretation of the New Testament, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. New Seventh Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Pages 290. Price \$1.50. A. C. Armstrong & Son, 3 and 5 West 18th Street, New York.

Dr. Broadus in his *Harmony* was the first one to depart from the traditional division of Christ's Ministry by Passovers. He finds that His ministry unfolds itself in well-defined and progressive stages as follows: (a) in our Lord's self-manifestation, (b) in the hostility of his enemies, and (c) in His training of the twelve Apostles. The harmony is divided into eight parts: Part 1, Matters Connected with our Lord's Birth and Childhood; Part 2, Beginning of the Forerunner's Ministry; Part 3, Beginnings of our Lord's Ministry; Part 4, Our Lord's Great Ministry in Galilee; Part 5, Seasons of Retirement into Districts Around Galilee; Part 6, Closing Ministry in all Parts of the Holy Land; Part 7, Last Week of our Lord's Ministry, and His Crucifixion; Part 8, Our Lord's Resurrection, Appearances, and Ascension. As an aid to the reader the chief marks of the historical progress in the Life of our Lord are indicated by brief footnotes, and other notes in italic letters placed here and there between the sections. The text and the marginal notes are those of the Revised Version. This, the seventh edition of the *Harmony*, has been carefully revised by Dr. Robertson. Important changes have been made especially in the notes at the end of the book. Further helps added in this edition are an excellent map of Palestine, a brief analytical outline put by itself in front as well as preserved in the body of the text, Dr. Broadus' "Analysis and Peculiarities of the Gospel" given in an appendix, new lists of the parables, miracles, Old Testament quotations, uncanonical sayings of Jesus and a list of chief harmonies. There is added, also, a full index of persons and places and the usual synopsis with tables for finding passages.

"The Explanatory Notes on Points of Special Difficulty" by



Dr. A. T. Robertson are a valuable part of the book. They touch on the Genealogies of Christ, the Probable Time of the Savior's Birth, the Feast of John 5: 1, and the Duration of our Lord's Ministry, the Four Lists of the Twelve Apostles, the Sermon on the Mount, etc.

A Gospel Harmony is indispensable for the student of the life of Christ. Not only professors and preachers, but teachers and laymen generally will find it necessary for a clear and connected study of the gospels. Of the late Harmonies this is doubtless one of the best. "It contains the ripe fruit of a lifetime of rich study and reflection by one of the rarest teachers of the New Testament that any age or country has ever seen."

G. W. R.

**MEDITATIONS FOR THE PASSION SEASON.** Translated from the German by Charles E. Hay, D.D. The original is the "Evangelical Haus-Agende" by George Christian Dieffenbach. To which is added a Harmonized History of the Passion of our Savior according to the Four Gospels. Pages 238. Price 75 cts. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

The purpose of this book is purely devotional. For its translation we owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Hay, who has already approved himself an expert in the art of translation from the German in his Koestlin's Theology of Luther. The plan of the meditations is to present a general prayer, a suitable scripture passage with a devotional exposition of three to four pages, and a closing prayer, suitable to each day of the Lenten Season beginning with Ash Wednesday and ending with the Saturday before Easter. The author, Dr. Diffenbach, is thoroughly imbued with the Spirit of the Church Year and the meditations will appeal especially to those churches and individuals who have been trained according to that system. In the introduction we read the following: "The Passion Season as it progresses brings into ever clearer view the two natures of Christ, His divinity and His humanity. It presents at once to our reverent thought the eternal divine High-priest in His glory, and the sacrificial offering rendered in His bitter sufferings and death. The former appears in the Gospel lessons appointed to be read upon the Sundays of Lent, and in the lessons for Monday and Tuesday of each week, the latter, in the extracts for Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. The Epistle for each Saturday of the period makes practical application of the lessons of the week immediately preceding." The lessons are selected according to a fixed principle and running through them is an edifying doctrinal as well as devotional spirit.

We consider the book superior to most of the English works of their class that have come into our hands. It breathes the deep

piety of the German heart; it is thoroughly churchly; and its expositions are based upon the Scripture passages which the Universal Church recognizes as appropriate for the season. It will be a most valuable guide for private devotions in the closet, for family worship, and for the preacher in his preparation for the Lenten Services. It will teach men how to pray and cultivate the meditative and devotional spirit which is so much jeopardized by the practical spirit of the age.

The last seventeen pages contain a harmonized history of the Passion of our Savior according to the four Gospels. It will serve as a guide for the Scripture readings in the Passion week services. The record is divided into seven sections, leaving one section for each day of the week.

G. W. R.

**AN ADVENTUROUS QUEST.** A Story of Three Boys as Told by the Friend in Whom they Confided. By Laura Scherer Copenhagen. Pages 405. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa. Price \$1.25.

This is a book for boys and girls. It is adapted for the Sunday-school library and the home circle. It presents in an interesting and forcible way the story of the adventures of Paul Hillis who is the hero. He is the son of a clergyman and as a boy proved himself a leader in school by winning literary and oratorical contests. He became the pet of parents and friends who freely showered their congratulations upon him. The spirit of pride and superiority was stirred up in him which entered into conflict with the spirit of true manliness which he imbibed under the influence of his parents. When he entered college he bore with him the words of a dying mother, "never work for anything lower than the highest." The "adventurous quest" was henceforth after "the highest." But the temptations of college life had great power over him. Ensnared by a "little sin" he was soon in the grasp of a greater one. His conscience became callous and he became indifferent toward evil. He was not positively bad, nor did he resist evil, nor did he strive to save others from it. His repentance came the last year of his course. He felt deeply humiliated, now inferior to every one else. He had thus far failed in his quest for "the highest." He had recourse to prayer. His petitions for strength were answered. The spirit of his life was changed, as appeared by his words and acts. He became a minister and thus fulfilled his parents' desires and found, also, his ideal of life in obedience and service. The author is acquainted with the spirit of boyhood in school and college and in a very readable story presents the temptations and the victorious conflicts of vigorous and ambitious youth.

G. W. R.